



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 2019

No. 46

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARBAJAL).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

March 14, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable SALUD O. CARBAJAL to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Merciful God, thank You for giving us another day.

Your care and wisdom are shown to us by the way You extend Your kingdom into our world down to the present day. Your word reveals every aspect of Your saving plan. You accomplish Your designed purpose in and through the hearts of the faithful who respond to You.

Today, convert our minds and hearts that we may become the great Nation You hope us to be.

Help the Members of this people's House to seek Your presence in the midst of their busy lives. Animate them with Your Spirit, and help them to perform their appointed tasks to come to solutions that will redound to the benefit of our Nation.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. HARDER of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HARDER of California. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. HARDER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HARDER of California led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S PROPOSED BUDGET

(Mr. HARDER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARDER of California. Mr. Speaker, this week, the administration released its proposed budget, and I am here to share what those budget cuts actually mean for the farmers in my home, California's Central Valley.

Imagine you are an almond farmer in the Central Valley. Maybe your farm has been a part of the family for multiple generations. Over the past 5 years, you have seen your net farm income has dropped by half, the largest drop since the Great Depression.

Then you wake up this week and hear that the administration, which promised to be in your corner, wants to cut billions of dollars from programs that help you and your family put food on tables across the country:

Programs like crop insurance so if you lose your crops from flooding or from fires your farm stays afloat. Under this budget, crop insurance is cut by \$26 billion;

Programs like drought relief to make up for damaged properties during arid seasons. Well, under this budget drought relief is cut by \$8 billion.

Or imagine you live in a district like mine where water management and storage are essential. Well, under this budget, 30 percent of the Army Corps of Engineers' budget is cut, putting all those structures at risk.

GOOD NEWS ABOUT THE OPIOID EPIDEMIC

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to address an issue that impacts all our congressional districts and communities: the opioid crisis.

For years now, it seems that the only news about it has been bad news: 70,000 overdose deaths in 2017, widespread importation of deadly drugs like fentanyl, families devastated, lives wasted.

But now, finally, some good news to report. In my district, specifically, in

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2721

Hamilton County, we have had a 20 percent decrease in opioid deaths in the first half of 2018.

The decline is the result of multiple prevention efforts, a task force of first responders, law enforcement, health officials, and community leaders all working together to tackle this deadly epidemic. Their efforts are truly saving lives in our community.

Most importantly, their successes can be used as a model to help save thousands and thousands of lives across the country. And I can't think of any better news than that.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S BUDGET

(Mr. CARBAJAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, this week the President broke his promise to America's seniors that he would not cut Medicare or Social Security benefits.

After Republicans in Congress passed a massive tax giveaway for corporations and the wealthiest 1 percent, the President now wants to balance the budget on the backs of our seniors and students.

This budget cuts \$2 trillion from Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security over the next 10 years, programs that our seniors have paid into for decades.

As students face a \$1 trillion student loan debt crisis, Trump's budget pushes affordable college further out of reach by cutting \$207 billion from student loan programs.

Thankfully, Americans voted overwhelmingly last election to place a check on this President by sending a new Democratic majority to Congress, and they can rest assured knowing that we will not consider the President's cruel budget cuts in this House.

GOVERNMENT TRANSPARENCY

(Mr. COLLINS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have thus far released the interview transcripts of two individuals at the heart of the 2016 DOJ investigations controversy. Today, I am releasing a third.

As I have said before, I believe the American people deserve transparency and deserve to know what transpired at the highest echelons of the FBI during this tumultuous time for the Bureau.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I request the link, dougcollins.house.gov/strzok be placed into the RECORD so that the American people can review the transcript of Peter Strzok.

Out of an abundance of caution, this transcript has a limited number of narrowly tailored redactions relating only to confidential sources and methods, nonpublic information about ongoing

investigations and nonmaterial personal information.

I will continue to work to release as many transcripts as possible. The American people deserve transparency and the truth.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S PROPOSED BUDGET CUTS

(Mr. O'HALLERAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep concerns over the proposed budget cuts made in the President's budget and the skyrocketing deficits that will leave our children and grandchildren with trillions more in debt.

While it is imperative that we rein in wasteful government spending and get our national debt under control, we cannot do so at the expense of the men and women living in rural and Tribal communities and our seniors.

This budget proposal slashes trillions from healthcare programs that millions of seniors, working families, and veterans rely on every day. Additionally, it would cut infrastructure programs and funding for critical projects in rural America and hurt farming families.

This is not how we are going to curb spending and get our fiscal house in order. We need to act now to pass a bipartisan budget that addresses the debt crisis and invests in the future of our Nation.

THANKING THE ADMINISTRATION FOR DISASTER RELIEF IN NORTHERN CALIFORNIA

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, 25 months ago, we saw the crisis in Oroville, California, of the broken spillway at Oroville Dam, belonging to the State water project. Thankfully, emergency services were able to come in and, as soon as possible, get things functioning once again for the safety of the flood control as well as the storage and the hydroelectricity that is produced there.

We had much help that came from FEMA; and I want to say thank you to the folks at FEMA, this administration, and Secretary Nielsen for being on the spot in helping with this restoration process. \$333 million have flowed to helping the crisis at the spillway be restored to a working spillway.

Now, there are those who are clamoring for even more money, but that lies on the backs of the State of California and the DWR for the extra money, bringing it up to \$1.1 billion.

The State of California claims it is in a surplus situation, and it needs to pay its own bills and put the money aside to take care of the project—not the other 49 States—for the nonemergency part of the project.

So, again, thanks to FEMA for their attention to this, as well as the wildfire situation we had in Paradise, California, for helping us in northern California.

SUPPORTING THE DREAM AND PROMISE ACT

(Ms. GARCIA of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong and unwavering support for H.R. 5, the Dream and Promise Act.

I am proud to represent the 29th Congressional District of Texas. One of the things I am most proud of is the strong and vibrant immigration communities that reside in our district, where thousands of DACA, TPS, and DED recipients live, work, and play beside us as neighbors and colleagues. If Dreamers were forced to leave our district tomorrow, we would lose over \$400 million of GDP.

Our immigration policies put politics over people, which often hurt our children who are in constant fear of being separated and uprooted from the country they call their own. This is wrong for our economy. This is wrong for our communities. This is wrong for our country.

It is time that we pass a permanent solution for these vital members of our society, which is why I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 5.

WE HAVE GOT TO KNOW IF OUR PRESIDENT IS A CROOK

(Mr. CASTEN of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, just last week we passed H.R. 1, the For the People Act, with its worthy aim: to ensure that this government represents the voices of all Americans and not just the privileged and powerful.

Now, among the many reforms in H.R. 1, one would require that candidates for President and Vice President must disclose their tax returns. Giving voters personal tax information has been a tradition of Presidents since 1973, when Richard Nixon, of all people, released his returns and said: "People have got to know whether or not their President is a crook." On that issue, I agree with Mr. Nixon.

Now, that seems to be the thinking of my home State legislature, too, which has been working on legislation that would require any Presidential or Vice Presidential candidate who wants to be on the ballot in Illinois to release their tax returns. They think that the people have the right to know the true character of the person who will sit in the White House.

Mr. Speaker, we have got to know if our President is a crook. I would like to see the Senate take up this bill.

And if they are unable to follow in the great leadership of this House, I

hope that other States will follow the great leadership of the State of Illinois.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUTTERFIELD). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE REPORT OF SPECIAL COUNSEL MUELLER SHOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC AND TO CONGRESS

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 208, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 24) expressing the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Mueller should be made available to the public and to Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 208, the amendments to the concurrent resolution and the preamble, printed in House Report 116-17, are agreed to, and the concurrent resolution, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution, as amended, is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 24

Whereas, on January 6, 2017, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence released a report concluding that “Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the US presidential election”, that the goal of this campaign was “to undermine public faith in the US democratic process”, and that “Putin and the Russian Government developed a clear preference for President-elect Trump”;

Whereas, on March 20, 2017, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) testified that he was authorized by the Department of Justice to confirm that the FBI is investigating whether “there was any coordination” between individuals associated with the Trump presidential campaign and the Russian Government;

Whereas part 600 of title 28, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on March 7, 2019 (in this resolution referred to as “Special Counsel Regulations”), provides for the appointment of a Special Counsel when the Attorney General or Acting Attorney General “determines that criminal investigation of a person or matter is warranted and—(a) That investigation . . . by a United States Attorney’s Office or litigating Division of the Department of Justice would present a conflict of interest for the Department or other extraordinary circumstances; and (b) That under the circumstances, it would be in the public interest to appoint an outside Special Counsel to assume responsibility for the matter”;

Whereas the Special Counsel Regulations call for any individual named as Special Counsel to be a “lawyer with a reputation for integrity and impartial decision making and with appropriate experience to ensure that both the investigation will be conducted ably, expeditiously and thoroughly, and that investigative and prosecutorial decisions will be supported by an informed understanding of the criminal law and Department of Justice policies”;

Whereas, on May 17, 2017, the Acting Attorney General appointed former FBI Director Robert S. Mueller III to serve as Special Counsel “to ensure a full and thorough investigation of the Russian government’s efforts to interfere in the 2016 presidential election”, including an exam-

ination of “any links and/or coordination between the Russian government and individuals associated with the campaign of President Donald Trump”, “any matters that arose or may arise directly from the investigation”, and “any other matters within the scope of 28 C.F.R. 600.4(a)”;

Whereas the Acting Attorney General explained that he had appointed Special Counsel Mueller because he “determined that it is in the public interest . . . to . . . appoint a Special Counsel to assume responsibility for this matter . . . based upon the unique circumstances, the public interest requires [him] to place this investigation under the authority of a person who exercises a degree of independence from the normal chain of command . . . [and that] a Special Counsel is necessary in order for the American people to have full confidence in the outcome. Our nation is grounded on the rule of law, and the public must be assured that government officials administer the law fairly”;

Whereas Special Counsel Mueller has previously served in the Department of Justice as a prosecutor, United States Attorney, and Director of the FBI under both Republican and Democratic administrations, and his selection as the Special Counsel elicited bipartisan praise recognizing his reputation for competence, fairness, and nonpartisanship;

Whereas the Special Counsel’s investigation has thus far resulted in the public indictment of 34 individuals and 3 companies, 7 guilty pleas, and 1 conviction following a jury trial;

Whereas the Special Counsel Regulations provide that “[a]t the conclusion of the Special Counsel’s work, he or she shall provide the Attorney General with a confidential report explaining the prosecution or declination decisions reached by the Special Counsel”;

Whereas, on January 15, 2019, at his confirmation hearing before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Attorney General William Barr testified “I . . . believe it is very important that the public and Congress be informed of the results of the special counsel’s work. For that reason, my goal will be to provide as much transparency as I can consistent with the law”;

Whereas, on February 22, 2019, the chairs of six committees of the House of Representatives wrote to Attorney General Barr to inform him of their expectation that he will make Special Counsel Mueller’s report public “to the maximum extent permitted by law”;

Whereas transparency is consistent with the overall purpose and intent of the Special Counsel Regulations and the accompanying Department of Justice commentary, which notes the importance of “ensur[ing] congressional and public confidence in the integrity of the process”;

Whereas the need for transparency is most pronounced with regard to investigations that involve the President or individuals associated with his campaign as the President is responsible for the appointment of the senior leadership of the Department of Justice;

Whereas the Department of Justice’s United States Attorney’s Manual indicates that in public filings and proceedings, prosecutors “should remain sensitive to the privacy and reputation interests of uncharged third-parties”, that is, of persons who the Department considers may be, but are not yet criminally charged;

Whereas this general nonstatutory policy of sensitivity to the “interests of uncharged third-parties” should be inapplicable to a sitting President because the Department of Justice’s Office of Legal Counsel has previously written that “a sitting President is constitutionally immune from indictment and criminal prosecution”;

Whereas the Department of Justice has on numerous recent occasions provided investigatory information to Congress and the public concerning investigations of high-level public officials in both pending and closed cases;

Whereas in the only other instance where a Special Counsel was appointed under the Spe-

cial Counsel Regulations (in 1999, concerning the 1993 confrontation in Waco, Texas), both the interim and final reports, including findings, provided by the Special Counsel were released to the public by the Attorney General; and

Whereas the allegations at the center of Special Counsel Mueller’s investigation strike at the core of our democracy, and there is an overwhelming public interest in releasing the Special Counsel’s report to ensure public confidence in both the process and the result of the investigation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) calls for the public release of any report, including findings, Special Counsel Mueller provides to the Attorney General, except to the extent the public disclosure of any portion thereof is expressly prohibited by law; and

(2) calls for the full release to Congress of any report, including findings, Special Counsel Mueller provides to the Attorney General.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

□ 0915

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 24.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H. Con. Res. 24 expresses the sense of Congress that any report Special Counsel Robert Mueller delivers to the Attorney General should be released to the public and to Congress. This concurrent resolution is important for several reasons.

First, transparency is fundamental to the special counsel process, especially when dealing with matters of national security involving the President.

In January 2017, the U.S. intelligence community unanimously reported that “Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the U.S. Presidential election” and that “Putin and the Russian Government developed a clear preference for President-elect Trump.” As a result of the importance of this charge and the clear conflict of interest in a matter involving the President, Robert Mueller was appointed as special counsel by the Acting Attorney General “in order for the American people to have full confidence in the outcome.”

This is why in the only other instance involving the appointment of a special counsel under the regulations, concerning the Waco tragedy, the special counsel’s report was released in full by the Attorney General.

Second, this resolution is critical because of the many questions and criticisms of the investigation raised by the President and his administration. It is

important that Congress stand up for the principle of full transparency at a time when the President has publicly attacked the Russian investigation more than 1,100 times and counting. Among other things, the President has repeatedly referred to the investigation as a “witch hunt” and called it a “hoax,” “rigged,” and a “scam.”

This resolution is also needed because high-ranking DOJ officials have indicated that they may not release information about individuals who are not indicted. Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein stated last month that “if we aren’t prepared to prove our case beyond a reasonable doubt in court, then we have no business making allegations against American citizens.”

This normally salutary policy must not apply in the event the Department adheres to its policy that it cannot indict a sitting President. To maintain that a sitting President cannot be indicted no matter how much evidence there is because he is a sitting President, and then to withhold evidence of wrongdoing from Congress because the President cannot be charged, is to convert DOJ policy into the means for a coverup.

Third, releasing the Mueller report, even in its entirety, does not absolve the Department of Justice of its obligation to provide Congress with the underlying evidence uncovered by the special counsel. This expectation is well grounded in precedent set by the Department just in the last Congress in connection with three Republican-led investigations into Hillary Clinton’s emails, the dismissal of former FBI Acting Director McCabe, and allegations of bias concerning the Russian investigation.

With respect to the investigation involving Secretary Clinton’s emails, this included the Department of Justice releasing to Congress more than 880,000 pages of documents regarding the FBI’s decisionmaking, identifying to Congress the names of career officials involved in the charging decision, identifying to Congress specific court cases relied on in the charging decision, and making numerous DOJ and FBI personnel available to Congress for transcribed interviews.

With respect to the dismissal of former Acting Director McCabe, this included releasing to Congress all documents relied on by the Office of Professional Responsibility in making its decision.

With respect to claims of bias in the Russian investigation, this included not only releasing to the public an otherwise classified foreign intelligence application, but also releasing to Congress: one, all underlying documents and communications involving the FISA applications; two, four memos detailing the former FBI Director’s communications with the President; three, materials pertaining to classified briefings involving the Trump and Clinton Presidential campaigns; and four, making even more DOJ and FBI officials

available for a total of 21 transcribed interviews and hearings.

These precedents make clear the obligation of the Department of Justice to release all evidence with respect to the Russian investigation.

A vote for this resolution will send a clear signal to both the American people and to the Department of Justice that Congress believes transparency is a fundamental principle necessary to ensure that government remains accountable to the public.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting this commonsense resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to support this resolution, but as a matter of time and coming through this week, I have 30 minutes, so I might as well talk about a resolution that is a restatement of the regulation. I want to provide some background on the special counsel’s regulations.

Special Counsel Mueller is operating under a different regulatory framework from the independent counsel statute that gave us the Starr report.

The Clinton administration Justice Department, which was led by Attorney General Janet Reno, Deputy Attorney General Eric Holder, and Neal Katyal, drafted the special counsel regulations in effect today. They established a regulatory framework that gives the Attorney General flexibility.

Attorney General Barr has a few options when he receives the information from Mr. Mueller. He can give Congress the complete report or a summary, or he can simply tell Congress that the Mueller investigation has concluded.

The Clinton administration regulations do not require a full report to Congress. However, during his confirmation, Attorney General Barr said he wants to be “transparent” with Congress and the public “consistent with the rules and the law.” I have no reason to think Attorney General Barr would back away from those statements he made before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I believe he is truthful and will be truthful to his word to make as much public as he possibly can.

The American people should not expect another Starr report. The Clinton Justice Department made sure another President would not have salacious stories aired before the American people. Janet Reno herself testified before Congress in 1999 that it was a bad idea for independent counsels to publish final reports.

Many Members of the Democratic majority in Congress today voted against the public release of materials related to the Starr report.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a narrative related to a roll call vote

from the 105th Congress. For the RECORD, I note that the following Democratic Members voted against the release of the Starr materials: Speaker PELOSI, Majority Whip CLYBURN, Chairman NADLER, Chairman CUMMINGS, Chairman ENGEL, Chairman WATERS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MARKEY, Chair LOFGREN, and Chairman NEAL, among others.

It is amazing that we have now changed our perspective on that, in light of a Republican in the White House.

Again, this resolution simply, basically, restates the regulations that are currently in place that were written under the Clinton Department of Justice. It is going to go forward. The new Attorney General has said he wants to make as much public to the American people as he legally can.

I believe in transparency. I believe that there are many other things we could be working on, but I am happy to support a resolution that is actually just a restatement of the regulatory burden already placed upon the Attorney General.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the distinguished chairwoman of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman NADLER for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H. Con. Res. 24, which expresses the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Robert Mueller should be available to the public and to Congress.

Special Counsel Mueller has been appointed to ensure a full and thorough investigation of the Russian Government’s efforts to interfere in the 2016 Presidential election and to examine any links and/or coordination between the Russian Government and individuals associated with the campaign of President Donald Trump.

He has also been appointed with the authority to investigate and prosecute Federal crimes committed in the course of and with the intent to interfere with the investigation, including perjury, obstruction of justice, destruction of evidence, and intimidation of witnesses.

The gravity and magnitude of this investigation, given that it goes straight to the heart of our democracy and involves the President of the United States, requires the public release of the special counsel’s findings.

This is an investigation that affects each and every American, whether it implicates or exonerates the President. Therefore, it must be brought to light so that the American people can see for themselves the findings and determinations made by an objective, impartial investigator who has a reputation for integrity.

In addition, the report will provide valuable insight and information for the important investigations being undertaken in the House, including the

investigation being conducted by the Committee on Financial Services on money laundering and the President's finances.

Special Counsel Mueller has been appropriately deliberate and discreet in conducting this investigation. It is clear from the manner in which the special counsel has approached this investigation that he has taken it seriously and has not conducted what President Trump refers to as a "witch hunt."

So far, the special counsel's investigation has resulted in 199 criminal charges, 37 indictments or guilty pleas, and five prison sentences.

Whatever his prosecutorial decisions may be going forward, it is in the public's interest to be given full transparency into those decisions and the explanations behind them.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the distinguished chair of the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) for yielding and for his sponsorship of this important legislation. I rise in strong support.

Special Counsel Robert Mueller was appointed in May 2017 to oversee the ongoing criminal and counterintelligence investigation into Russia's interference in the 2016 election. Over the nearly 2 years since his appointment, the special counsel has indicted 34 individuals and three companies, and secured guilty pleas or convictions from eight individuals.

We do not know when the special counsel will complete his work, but there are indications that it could occur in the near future.

Notwithstanding the overwhelming public interest in the special counsel's report and findings, I am deeply concerned that Attorney General Barr may attempt to withhold Mueller's full report from the public and the underlying evidence from Congress and could instead seek to provide only a CliffsNotes version of the report to Congress.

As this resolution makes clear, Congress will not accept any attempt by Mr. Barr or the President to bury the report and the findings of the special counsel. Withholding this information would be untenable in light of the intense public interest and need for transparency, but particularly so when the Department has provided voluminous production to Congress at the demand of the previous majority, including sensitive FISA materials and other classified and law enforcement-sensitive materials related to the Mueller investigation and the Clinton email investigation.

Last year, I repeatedly warned Department leadership that, in providing these materials to Congress, they were establishing a precedent and one that they would have to live with in the future. They did so anyway.

While anonymous sources at the Department have attempted to publicly blame James Comey for the provision of this information, in fact, the Department has turned over more than 880,000 pages of documents from the Clinton email investigation to Congress, all of them—all of them—pursuant to congressional subpoenas issued after James Comey was fired. They have produced highly sensitive records, including FISA materials, directly related to ongoing investigations at the core of the special counsel's charter.

To be sure, something far more serious than precedent is at stake. Disclosure is uniquely imperative here because the special counsel reportedly is investigating whether the President himself engaged in misconduct. If the special counsel has indeed uncovered evidence of serious wrongdoing on the President's part, then that evidence must be furnished to Congress and ultimately to the American people.

Withholding the full report or underlying evidence would only heighten concerns over a coverup or a pernicious or partisan double standard.

The special counsel's regulations were written, above all, to ensure public confidence in the fair and impartial administration of justice. That charge would be entirely vitiated by an attempt to cover up or conceal Special Counsel Mueller's findings and report, whatever they may be and whenever they are finalized.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members of both parties to join me in supporting this resolution and to make clear that anything less than full transparency is unacceptable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

□ 0930

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman NADLER for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution requesting that Special Counsel Mueller's report be made available to the public.

There are three reasons why this must happen.

First, the taxpayers paid for this report. The American people funded this investigation. They have a right to see the contents of the report of the investigation.

Second, internal bureaucratic Department of Justice policies do not apply to Congress, especially on matters of national importance.

And third, if we don't get this report, it could amount to a cover-up.

The United States Constitution does not say that a sitting President cannot be indicted. There is nothing in the Constitution that would prevent that.

Unfortunately, the Department of Justice has taken the policy position that they are not going to indict a sitting President, which means that the only institution that can hold the President accountable is Congress. If we do not get this information, we cannot effectively do our jobs, we cannot hold the President accountable, and it is something that the American public wants to see.

Over 87 percent of respondents in a recent poll say that this report should be made available to Congress and to the American public. If the Department of Justice does not do this, we all need to ask: What are they trying to hide?

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership and for introducing this incredibly important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the investigation currently under way by Special Counsel Robert Mueller is incredibly important: an open investigation into incredibly serious allegations, potential obstruction of justice, corruption, and possible links of coordination between President Trump's Presidential campaign and the Russian Government, efforts to meddle in our democratic process, and mislead and manipulate American voters.

The allegations at the center of this investigation, as I said, are serious, they are credible, and they are unprecedented. With 37 indictments and counting, it is of paramount importance that the special counsel's report and the underlying evidence be made public for the sake of transparency and trust in our government.

As a nation, as a Congress, and as a Republic, we need to know all of the facts about this investigation and what unfolded between players in the President's campaign and Russia in 2016. We must protect and respect the work of Special Counsel Mueller, and his report must be released, in full, for the Congress and for the American people to see.

Mr. Speaker, again, I thank the chairman for introducing this resolution, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitution, Civil Rights and Civil Liberties.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, what we are discussing is one of the most important documents that will ever be produced and given, potentially, to Congress for the American people in

our modern history: a question of whether or not this administration was involved with the Russian Government, our number one foreign enemy, in influencing the outcome of our Presidential election, something tantamount to treason.

The report needs to be made public because the American people have a right to know. The American people, as Ronald Reagan, to paraphrase, said: I paid for this microphone, the American people paid for this report, they paid for the special counsel, they deserve to see the fruits of his work and whether or not, as Richard Nixon said, their President is a crook, they need to know that.

Unfortunately, as I sit here listening to this discussion, I feel like I am thrown back into a time in the 1970s—I think it was 1977, somewhere around there—in Kinshasa, Zaire, not in the Washington, D.C. capitol. It is the Muhammad Ali-George Foreman fight, and the other side, the Republicans, are playing the role of Muhammad Ali. Not the “float like a butterfly, sting like a bee” Muhammad Ali, but the rope-a-dope, sit back, take the punches, let them swing, let them hit you, because they know that eventually they will wear themselves out and they know the outcome, because the fix is in.

There is a reason why the Attorney General was picked by this President, and we will soon find out. But we need to pass this resolution and show the American people that Congress is on the side of transparency and are releasing this report and letting the American public, who paid for this report, know the results of it and know what needs to happen to protect our democracy and the rule of law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are, again, reminded that they should refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, how about engaging in personalities against the sitting Attorney General? You are saying that he was appointed for a reason.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Is it not also directed at the House to not also impugn the integrity and the character of a sitting Cabinet member?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. At this time, the gentleman from Georgia is advised that the Chair will not issue an advisory opinion.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I wouldn't want to do it either, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not offer an advisory opinion.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Offer? Can you offer it? You said you were able to offer an advisory opinion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will once again advise that the

rule requires Members to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I continue my parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I made a parliamentary inquiry concerning a Cabinet member, not the President. I understand your advisory opinion against the President. I fully agree with it. I am asking about a member of the Cabinet.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that the rule does not extend to a member of the Cabinet.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Wow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Those are the rules of the House. The gentleman is advised.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Wow. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for enlightening us on that. It is okay, basically, if you impugn the integrity of a sitting member of the Cabinet. I guess we just learned something new today. That is encouraging. As far as Members of the House, I get that it is not in the rules, but it also shouldn't be a part of this debate.

This is a simple resolution. It simply restates the regulation. Don't make it any more or any less than what it is. That is why we are here. We are going to approve this, we are going to vote for it, but let's not make it any more than what it is. Let's continue on so we can get a vote, everybody can go home, and maybe we will come back and actually vote on legislation that actually matters.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 24, to express the sense of Congress that Special Counsel Mueller's report be made available to the American people and to Congress. We cannot impugn the integrity of the American people by keeping this report silenced.

For nearly 2 years, Special Counsel Robert Mueller and his team have investigated serious and credible allegations about obstruction of justice and collusion at the highest levels of our government. To date, Mr. Speaker, the investigation has led to the public indictment of three companies and 34 individuals, including the indictment of President Trump's former campaign manager and personal lawyer, seven guilty pleas, and one conviction following a jury trial. The allegations range from election interference, to lying to the FBI, to conspiracy to defraud the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this should not be a Republican or a Democratic issue. I hope that my colleagues on the other side

will understand that there should be nothing to hide from the American people about this investigation, a special counsel's investigation into whether there was interference in our elections.

If my Republican colleagues have nothing to fear from this report, if they are willing to stand up for the Constitution, if they are willing to stand up for the American people and put that Constitution over party, over any individual, including the one that sits in the White House, then they, too, will join us in voting unanimously for this resolution.

It is a big deal for the American people to maintain trust in our democracy and in our government. They have to know the results of the special counsel's report. This is, again, an American issue. It is about doing our constitutional duty to protect our democracy.

I look forward, Mr. Speaker, to having a unanimous vote on this resolution, passing it through and making it clear that we have nothing to hide. It is our duty to the American people.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I don't know, maybe I need to make the talking points to the other side clear. I agreed on Monday that I was voting for this. We are not opposing this, because it is simply a restatement of the regulation. I know that it is fashionable to think that we are not. So, again, I am sorry, I could have maybe made the talking points more clear at Rules that I was voting for this so we could have saved extra time on some of the discussion here.

Mr. Speaker, again, we will continue to go through this, and, at this point, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), the sponsor of this legislation to ensure that the work of the special counsel is not suppressed and will offer valuable assistance on today's resolution.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his work on this.

Mr. Speaker, the relentless, baseless attacks on an American patriot, Robert Mueller, and his team, have moved us ever so closer to a constitutional crisis. Just as we cannot yield to Trump's attempt to discredit this distinguished team of legal experts, neither can we let them bury the results of this taxpayer-funded investigation.

Having nothing to fear means having nothing to hide. Those who seek to hide this report, obviously, do not believe that the truth will set them free. Rather, as it has for so many of Mr. Trump's sleazy cohorts, they feel that the truth will lock them up. So many lies, so much daily deceit. Already so much evidence of collusion and obstruction and, from the organization's own former lawyer, evidence of an apparent criminal enterprise that bears the name of the Trump organization.

If it is a witch hunt, Mr. President, it has more witches than a Mar-a-Lago

Halloween party. And your witches' brew seems to have cast a spell over many Members of this Congress who find themselves locked in continuing silence or wishy-washy efforts to ignore and bolster your floundering Presidency.

Today's resolution says to President Trump, who has shown some consistent disregard for the rule of law: You cannot seize and secret evidence of conduct that others need to see. Let the taxpayers see the results of the investigation of the wrongdoing, which their dollars have rightly funded.

Our congressional duty is to enforce the borders, to be Border Patrol people, to see that this President, who is willing to cross every line, every constitutional boundary, to see that he is contained within the borders of the Constitution. For the rule of law to stand, the administration cannot be allowed to sit on the special counsel's report.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 26½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES).

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding. And I also thank the ranking member. I very much appreciate his comments that he will support this concurrent resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I will just observe, as a member of the Intelligence Committee, that we have seen our politics twisted into almost unrecognizable form by the unprecedented attacks of the President on the Department of Justice, on the FBI, on the investigation as a whole.

This report must see the light of day and must be made available to the American public for a catharsis that will allow us to start with the facts, to understand what happened and to rebuild the faith that the American people did and should have in the Department of Justice, in the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and in the government in general.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Congress, in strong, bipartisan fashion, passing this bill so that the American people will understand that the truth will be out there and it will help fix our politics.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman very much for yielding.

I, too, add my appreciation to Mr. COLLINS' eagerness to adhere to what I think is an appropriate policy that reasserts the article I authority, if you will, of the Congress. And I think it is important for my colleagues to recognize that Americans are wondering. They are wondering. They have heard over and over again of Russian collusion. They have heard the factual affirmation that the Russians did interfere with the 2016 election and tried to interfere with the 2018 election. Therefore, it is important for them, in their concern, to be informed. They are taxpayers. We say this all the time.

□ 0945

And it is important to note that, through this investigation, the National Security Advisor and former foreign policy advisor and many others have gone to court because of Mr. Mueller.

It is indeed important to know that we have learned much because of his report, but we have not learned all. And we must overcome Attorney General Barr's hesitation, because the American people have made the point. The point is that 68 percent of them say that they would like to see this report.

Now, we know that it has been banded around that we cannot indict a President. This is not about indicting a President. But assuming, arguendo, that this regulation is correct, that someone thinks that that is constant law and the President cannot be subjected to criminal process and, therefore, cannot and should not be indicted, it is a logical fallacy to say that because he cannot be indicted by virtue of his office and because it is the Justice Department's regulation not to reveal information about unindicted parties and individuals.

The Justice Department cannot reveal any information or potential wrongdoing by the President and not reveal any information to the body that possesses the constitutional responsibility for holding this President accountable.

So let us follow good policy. Even the words of Attorney General Barr that recognizes that the DOJ's purpose is to release investigations in the public interest. This is in the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to all that we do this in a bipartisan way to give to the American people what they deserve and what they want.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Committee on Judiciary, which has oversight of the Department of Justice, and as a Senior Member of the Committee on Homeland Security, which has oversight over our election security infrastructure, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 24.

Mr. Speaker, I rise because I believe our nation will soon be at an inflection point.

For many years now, Americans have wondered about the role of Russia's interference

in the 2016 election and whether that crime was aided and abetted by Associates of the Trump Campaign.

Americans have been concerned as we have watched a parade of colleagues and contemporaries of the President hauled before court.

This includes the President's National Security Advisor, his longtime confidante, his former foreign policy advisor, and yesterday his former campaign manager and his former campaign manager.

Indeed, the future that awaits the President's former campaign manager is bleak—he is facing 7.5 years in federal prison, and today a 16-count indictment was returned in Manhattan detailing residential mortgage fraud, conspiracy and falsifying business records.

Indeed, most if not all of what we have learned about those who surround the president has been because of the work of the Special Counsel, Robert Mueller.

It is important that whatever work Mr. Mueller has done, be shared by the American people.

This is for any number of reasons.

First of all, broad swaths of the American people want this report published.

The last public opinion poll conducted showed that 68% of Americans want this Mueller report published.

Next, the entire purpose of appointing a special counsel was because the president's first attorney General had to recuse himself because he was found to be less-than-truthful about his contacts with Kremlin officials during the 2016 campaign, on behalf of then Candidate Trump.

According to the former Acting Attorney General, the Special Counsel was appointed in order for the American people to have full confidence in the outcome of the investigation . . . the public must be assured that government officials administer the law fairly.

And thus far, Mr. Mueller's investigation has revealed the public indictment of 34 individuals, 3 companies, 7 guilty pleas and one 1 conviction following trial.

Through the work done by Mr. Mueller and his "speaking indictments," we learned that Russian military officials tried to wage an active measures campaign.

We know that the Russians manipulated our social media systems.

They did this by turning our social media platforms like Twitter and Facebook, into rowdy and unwieldy debates that turned Americans against one another.

They did this by creating fake online social media accounts and populated them on social media platforms.

After infiltrating the social media accounts of real Americans, these fake accounts sought to sow discord in these online communities by purposely exacerbating divisions within our nation and creating new ones—all with the intent of pitting Americans against one another.

While they were distorting the social media landscape, they were also selectively disseminating emails stolen from the Democratic National Committee and the campaign of Hillary Clinton with the purpose of timing the dissemination to maximize political damage on Secretary Clinton's campaign.

All the while, the President was encouraging this behavior.

And, despite protestations by the President, this is not a witch hunt—it has yielded the

public indictments of 34 individuals and 3 companies, 7 guilty pleas, and 1 conviction.

The American people are watching and paying attention.

The most recent public opinion poll shows that a super majority of Americans—a full 68%—wants the Mueller Report made public.

The Mueller Report is one unparalleled way in which Americans can learn this information with confidence.

And, finally, we must tackle a serious issue that is being discussed among elected officials and the Justice Department.

Over the past two years, we have been told that it is Justice Department regulations that a sitting President cannot be indicted. I will note that this principle has not been tested in court.

That regulation was implemented during the Watergate investigation, under the theory that the President cannot be subjected to criminal process.

But, assuming *arguendo* that this regulation is correct, and the President cannot be subjected to criminal process and therefore cannot and should not be indicted, it is a logical fallacy to say that because he cannot be indicted by virtue of his office, and because it is Justice Department regulation not to reveal information about unindicted parties and individuals, the Justice Department cannot reveal any information of potential wrongdoing by the President and not reveal any information to the body that possesses the constitutional responsibility for holding this president accountable.

For these reasons, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 24, and urge my colleagues to support it and urge passage so the American people can learn how the 2016 election became a crime scene.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman NADLER for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, my call today is for full transparency, with a clear focus on the sinister motives of Russia's corrupt leaders. Their interference in our 2016 elections has created confusion, anger, bewilderment, and division—exactly what Russia wanted.

Today's resolution calls for the Department of Justice to make Special Counsel Robert Mueller's report, along with any findings, available to the public to the maximum extent permitted by the law and to provide the report and its findings, in entirety, to the Congress of the United States of America.

So whether you have used Special Counsel Mueller as a patriot conducting a nonpartisan investigation into a foreign power's possible influence in our elections or as a witch hunt, a full accounting and public release of the findings is needed to heal our political differences.

This is not about embarrassing President Trump. This is about closure and full disclosure.

If there was no collusion, as the President has emphasized, then he should want complete transparency. Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve no less.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader.

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, last week, the House passed H.R. 1, major legislation to strengthen voter access, address the corrosive influence of dark money in politics, institute national redistricting reform, and hold public officials accountable to higher standards of ethics and transparency.

Taking the next step, this week is sunshine week on the House floor. The House has already passed several pieces of legislation this week to modernize government and increase transparency, accountability, and good governance. They include measures aimed at shining a light onto Russia's malign activities around the world and the suppression of democracy within its own borders.

The resolution we now have before us expresses the sense of Congress that the American public ought to have transparency when it comes to the investigation into Russia's interference in our elections and efforts to undermine our democracy. It says that the special counsel's report ought to be made public to the fullest extent of the law and that Congress should see all of it.

Nearly 9 in 10 Americans believe the special counsel's report should be made public, and we have heard that from Republicans in Congress as well. I hope this will be a bipartisan vote to tell the American people: You have the right to and ought to know the results of this report.

One of my Republican colleagues, Representative MIKE TURNER from Ohio, said in February the report has to be made public.

SUSAN COLLINS of Maine said: "The American people deserve to know what the findings are of Mr. Mueller."

"I believe the report should be released," said Senator COLLINS.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me, Mr. NADLER, Republicans, and Democrats on supporting this resolution and in calling for transparency. Let's come together in a bipartisan vote to make it clear that the American people deserve to know the full extent of what Russia—of what Russia—has done in the objective of subverting and undermining our democratic institutions.

I thank the chair for bringing this resolution to the floor. I urge all of us to support it. Let's send a unanimous message to the Russians and to any other country or entity that would try to subvert our democratic elections that that will not be tolerated.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia has 26½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New York has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, as I said today, and it is interesting to me—I think this is the funny part of this, because so many times we would come up here and we retreat to our partisan sides and we say, I am going to be a "yes"; you are going to be a "no."

The sad part about it is the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), my colleague, I said "yes" on Monday night. I said "yes" to the resolution on Monday night. Yet it seems like somehow, through the process: Well, we need everybody to come together.

We have talked about this. It is nothing but a restatement of the regulation.

Attorney General Barr will follow the regulation. He has said so. He has been in committee, and during his time of confirmation, he has said so.

I think what we need to understand here, and maybe we also need to throw this out here, and maybe this is something because I have heard a lot of my colleagues across the aisle talk about what they believe should be in this report. Well, maybe I have a problem and maybe a news flash to give them: What happens when it comes back and says none of this was true, the President did not do anything wrong? Then the meltdown will occur.

I heard probably, earlier, just one of my colleagues actually on the other side stated that the elections has thrown chaos into the system. No, the reason the election has thrown chaos is because President Trump won and the Democratic candidate didn't know where Wisconsin was. You all remedied that this time, though. The Democratic candidate for President will actually have been to Wisconsin by the election day next time.

There are other reasons to do this. Transparency is good.

As we go forward, my hope would be, on this issue, let's let the report be given to the Attorney General. Let's let the Attorney General do the regulations and follow the regulations and give as much as he has said in his confirmation hearing: that he wants to be transparent, he wants to be a part, he wants this to come out, because he understands the questions and the turmoil that this has caused.

So I have nothing to believe that this would not be true. There is nothing that has been presented here today to think that it wouldn't be true. That is what makes this resolution even more amazing to me: Nothing has been presented that Mr. Barr would not do what the regulations say.

Now, there may be more on it and everything else, but let's talk about what actually the resolution says, and that is what it says.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, contrary to what the gentleman from Georgia implied a few

minutes ago, that we shouldn't be wasting our time on this because it only restates what the regulations require and the Judiciary Committee ought to be spending its time more productively, I simply want to say, first, that the Democratic House majority and the Judiciary Committee are not focused on the President to the exclusion of our legislative priorities.

In the 2 months since we organized, the Judiciary Committee has passed H.R. 8, the Bipartisan Background Checks Act of 2019, through the House and has passed H.R. 1112, the Enhanced Background Checks Act of 2019, through the House. H.R. 1585, the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2019, passed through the committee. We have passed H.R. 1, the For the People Act of 2019, through the House.

The Judiciary Committee has also held a hearing to begin the process of reauthorizing the Voting Rights Act and held a hearing to examine the state of competition in the healthcare industry, as well as the T-Mobile-Sprint merger.

We have introduced H.R. 5, the Equality Act; H.R. 1327, the Never Forget the Heroes: Permanent Authorization of September 11th Victim Compensation Fund Act; and the American Dream and Promise Act of 2019, the so-called Dreamers bill.

These are some of the things we have been doing besides looking into the possible misconduct by the President.

In closing, I would like to include the following items in the RECORD:

First, the U.S. Intelligence Community report concluding that Vladimir Putin ordered a misinformation campaign directed against the 2016 Presidential election and displayed a clear preference for then-candidate Donald Trump.

ASSESSING RUSSIAN ACTIVITIES AND
INTENTIONS IN RECENT US ELECTIONS
(January 6, 2017)
KEY JUDGMENTS

Russian efforts to influence the 2016 US presidential election represent the most recent expression of Moscow's longstanding desire to undermine the US-led liberal democratic order, but these activities demonstrated a significant escalation in directness, level of activity, and scope of effort compared to previous operations.

We assess Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the US presidential election. Russia's goals were to undermine public faith in the US democratic process, denigrate Secretary Clinton, and harm her electability and potential presidency. We further assess Putin and the Russian Government developed a clear preference for President-elect Trump. We have high confidence in these judgments.

We also assess Putin and the Russian Government aspired to help President-elect Trump's election chances when possible by discrediting Secretary Clinton and publicly contrasting her unfavorably to him. All three agencies agree with this judgment. CIA and FBI have high confidence in this judgment; NSA has moderate confidence.

Moscow's approach evolved over the course of the campaign based on Russia's under-

standing of the electoral prospects of the two main candidates. When it appeared to Moscow that Secretary Clinton was likely to win the election, the Russian influence campaign began to focus more on undermining her future presidency.

Further information has come to light since Election Day that, when combined with Russian behavior since early November 2016, increases our confidence in our assessments of Russian motivations and goals.

Moscow's influence campaign followed a Russian messaging strategy that blends covert intelligence operations—such as cyber activity—with overt efforts by Russian Government agencies, state-funded media, third-party intermediaries, and paid social media users or “trolls.” Russia, like its Soviet predecessor, has a history of conducting covert influence campaigns focused on US presidential elections that have used intelligence officers and agents and press placements to disparage candidates perceived as hostile to the Kremlin.

Russia's intelligence services conducted cyber operations against targets associated with the 2016 US presidential election, including targets associated with both major US political parties.

We assess with high confidence that Russian military intelligence (General Staff Main Intelligence Directorate or GRU) used the Guccifer 2.0 persona and DCLeaks.com to release US victim data obtained in cyber operations publicly and in exclusives to media outlets and relayed material to WikiLeaks.

Russian intelligence obtained and maintained access to elements of multiple US state or local electoral boards. DHS assesses that the types of systems Russian actors targeted or compromised were not involved in vote tallying.

Russia's state-run propaganda machine contributed to the influence campaign by serving as a platform for Kremlin messaging to Russian and international audiences.

We assess Moscow will apply lessons learned from its Putin-ordered campaign aimed at the US presidential election to future influence efforts worldwide, including against US allies and their election processes.

Mr. NADLER. Second, I include a February 22, 2019, letter to the Attorney General from six House committee chairs expressing the expectation that the Mueller report will be made public and that the Department will make the underlying investigative materials available to committees upon request.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 22, 2019.
Hon. WILLIAM P. BARR,
Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: Recent reports suggest that Special Counsel Robert Mueller may be nearing the end of his investigation into “any links and/or coordination between the Russian government and individuals associated with the campaign of President Donald Trump” and other matters that may have arisen directly from the investigation. As you know, Department of Justice regulations require that, “[a]t the conclusion of the Special Counsel's work, he or she shall provide the Attorney General with a confidential report explaining the prosecution or declination decisions reached by the Special Counsel.”

After nearly two years of investigation—accompanied by two years of direct attacks on the integrity of the investigation by the President—the public is entitled to know what the Special Counsel has found. We

write to you to express, in the strongest possible terms, our expectation that the Department of Justice will release to the public the report Special Counsel Mueller submits to you—without delay and to the maximum extent permitted by law.

There also remains a significant public interest in the full disclosure of information learned by the Special Counsel about the nature and scope of the Russian government's efforts to undermine our democracy. To the extent that the Department believes that certain aspects of the report are not suitable for immediate public release, we ask that you provide that information to Congress, along with your reasoning for withholding the information from the public, in order for us to judge the appropriateness of any redactions for ourselves.

We also expect that the Department will provide to our Committees, upon request and consistent with applicable law, other information and material obtained or produced by the Special Counsel regarding certain foreign actors and other individuals who may have been the subject of a criminal or counterintelligence investigation. This expectation is well-grounded in the precedent set by the Department in recent years. In other closed and pending high-profile cases alleging wrongdoing by public officials, both the Department and the FBI have produced substantial amounts of investigative material, including classified and law enforcement sensitive information, to the House of Representatives.

Finally, although we recognize the policy of the Department to remain sensitive to the privacy and reputation interests of individuals who will not face criminal charges, we feel that it is necessary to address the particular danger of withholding evidence of misconduct by President Trump from the relevant committees.

If the Special Counsel has reason to believe that the President has engaged in criminal or other serious misconduct, then the President must be subject to accountability either in a court or to the Congress. But because the Department has taken the position that a sitting President is immune from indictment and prosecution, Congress could be the only institution currently situated to act on evidence of the President's misconduct. To maintain that a sitting president cannot be indicted, and then to withhold evidence of wrongdoing from Congress because the President will not be charged, is to convert Department policy into the means for a cover-up. The President is not above the law.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

REP. JERROLD NADLER,
Chairman, House Committee on the Judiciary.

REP. ELLIJAH CUMMINGS,
Chairman, House Committee on Oversight and Reform.

REP. ADAM SCHIFF,
Chairman, House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

REP. ELIOT ENGEL,
Chairman, House Foreign Affairs Committee.

REP. MAXINE WATERS,
Chairwoman, House Committee on Financial Services.

REP. RICHARD NEAL,
Chair, House Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Third, the introduction to the final report to the Deputy Attorney General concerning the 1993 confrontation at the Mount Carmel complex.

INTRODUCTION

This Report contains the findings of the Special Counsel in response to the questions directed to him by Attorney General Janet Reno in Order No. 2256-99, dated September 9, 1999. The questions pertain to the 1993 confrontation between federal law enforcement officials and the Branch Davidians at the Mt. Carmel complex near Waco, Texas. The Report is issued pursuant to Section (e) of Order No. 2256-99 which provides, in relevant part, that the Special Counsel shall submit "to the maximum extent possible . . . a final report . . . in a form that will permit public dissemination."

The Office of Special Counsel has organized the Report in the following format:

- (I) a description of the Issues investigated by the Special Counsel;
- (II) the Conclusions of the Special Counsel;
- (III) a description of the Investigative Methods used by the Special Counsel;
- (IV) a Statement of Facts relevant to the Special Counsel's investigation;
- (V) Exhibits to the text of the Report; and
- (VI) Appendices that include a narrative summary of the relevant beliefs and practices of the Branch Davidians, a summary of expert findings, a chronological table of events, and the reports of experts retained by the Office of Special Counsel.

Mr. NADLER. And fourth, the Department of Justice commentary interpreting the special counsel regulations.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Office of the Attorney General
28 CFR Parts 0 and 600
[A.G. Order No. 2232-99]
Office of Special Counsel

AGENCY: Department of Justice.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This order amends the Code of Federal Regulations to provide regulations concerning Attorney General appointment of Special Counsel to investigate and, when appropriate, to prosecute matters when the Attorney General concludes that extraordinary circumstances exist such that the public interest would be served by removing a large degree of responsibility for a matter from the Department of Justice. These regulations replace the procedures for appointment of independent counsel pursuant to the Independent Counsel Reauthorization Act of 1994.

EFFECTIVE DATES: July 1, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John C. Keeney, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC 20530, (202) 514-2621.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Attorney General is promulgating these regulations to replace the procedures set out in the Independent Counsel Reauthorization Act of 1994. These regulations seek to strike a balance between independence and accountability in certain sensitive investigations, recognizing that there is no perfect solution to the problem. The balance struck is one of day-to-day independence, with a Special Counsel appointed to investigate and, if appropriate, prosecute matters when the Attorney General concludes that extraordinary circumstances exist such that the public interest would be served by removing a large degree of responsibility for the matter from the Department of Justice. The Special Counsel would be free to struc-

ture the investigation as he or she wishes and to exercise independent prosecutorial discretion to decide whether charges should be brought, within the context of the established procedures of the Department. Nevertheless, it is intended that ultimate responsibility for the matter and how it is handled will continue to rest with the Attorney General (or the Acting Attorney General if the Attorney General is personally recused in the matter); thus, the regulations explicitly acknowledge the possibility of review of specific decisions reached by the Special Counsel.

The regulations also remove §0.14, setting forth procedures for Special Independent Counsels for members of Congress. The regulations in that section have been suspended since April 19, 1989. 54 FR 15752.

Section-by-Section Discussion

Section 600.1. Grounds for Appointing a Special Counsel

"The Attorney General, or in cases in which the Attorney General is recused, the Acting Attorney General, will appoint a Special Counsel when he or she determines that criminal investigation of a person or matter is warranted and—

(a) That investigation or prosecution of that person or matter by a United States Attorney's Office or litigating Division of the Department of Justice would present a conflict of interest for the Department or other extraordinary circumstances; and

(b) That under the circumstances, it would be in the public interest to appoint an outside Special Counsel to assume responsibility for the matter."

Section 600.2. Alternatives Available to the Attorney General

"When matters are brought to the attention of the Attorney General that might warrant consideration of appointment of a Special Counsel, the Attorney General may:

(a) Appoint a Special Counsel;

(b) Direct that an initial investigation, consisting of such factual inquiry or legal research as the Attorney General deems appropriate, be conducted in order to better inform the decision; or

(c) Conclude that under the circumstances of the matter, the public interest would not be served by removing the investigation from the normal processes of the Department, and that the appropriate component of the Department should handle the matter. If the Attorney General reaches this conclusion, he or she may direct that appropriate steps be taken to mitigate any conflicts of interest, such as recusal of particular officials."

Discussion:

There are occasions when the facts create a conflict so substantial, or the exigencies of the situation are such that any initial investigation might taint the subsequent investigation, so that it is appropriate for the Attorney General to immediately appoint a Special Counsel. In other situations, some initial investigation, whether factual or legal, may be appropriate to better inform the Attorney General's decision. This provision is intended to make it clear that a variety of approaches, even in cases that might create an apparent conflict of interest, may be appropriate, depending on the facts of the matter.

Section 600.3. Qualifications of the Special Counsel

"(a) An individual named as Special Counsel shall be a lawyer with a reputation for integrity and impartial decisionmaking, and with appropriate experience to ensure both that the investigation will be conducted ably, expeditiously and thoroughly, and that investigative and prosecutorial decisions will be supported by an informed under-

standing of the criminal law and Department of Justice policies. The Special Counsel shall be selected from outside the United States Government. Special Counsels shall agree that their responsibilities as Special Counsel shall take first precedence in their professional lives, and that it may be necessary to devote their full time to the investigation, depending on its complexity and the stage of the investigation.

"(b) The Attorney General shall consult with the Assistant Attorney General for Administration to ensure an appropriate method of appointment, and to ensure that a Special Counsel undergoes an appropriate background investigation and a detailed review of ethics and conflicts of interest issues. A Special Counsel shall be appointed as a 'confidential employee' as defined in 5 U.S.C. 7511(b)(2)(C)."

Section 600.4. Jurisdiction

"(a) Original Jurisdiction. The jurisdiction of a Special Counsel shall be established by the Attorney General. The Special Counsel will be provided with a specific factual statement of the matter to be investigated. The jurisdiction of a Special Counsel shall also include the authority to investigate and prosecute federal crimes committed in the course of, and with intent to interfere with, the Special Counsel's investigation, such as perjury, obstruction of justice, destruction of evidence, and intimidation of witnesses; and to conduct appeals arising out of the matter being investigated and/or prosecuted.

"(b) Additional Jurisdiction. If in the course of his or her investigation the Special Counsel concludes that additional jurisdiction beyond that specified in his or her original jurisdiction is necessary in order to fully investigate and resolve the matters assigned, or to investigate new matters that come to light in the course of his or her investigation, he or she shall consult with the Attorney General, who will determine whether to include the additional matters within the Special Counsel's jurisdiction or assign them elsewhere."

Discussion:

Under these regulations, it is intended that a Special Counsel's jurisdiction will be stated as an investigation of specific facts. The regulations also recognize, however, that accommodations can be made as necessary throughout the course of the investigation, with the Attorney General's approval. This provision establishes a protocol whereby Special Counsels are provided with an appropriate description of the boundaries of their investigation, with the full recognition that adjustments to that jurisdiction may be required.

Paragraph (b) establishes a single procedure through which a variety of different jurisdictional issues can be resolved. For example, a Special Counsel assigned responsibility for an alleged false statement about a government program may request additional jurisdiction to investigate allegations of misconduct with respect to the administration of that program; a Special Counsel may conclude that investigating otherwise unrelated allegations against a central witness in the matter is necessary to obtain cooperation; or a Special Counsel may come across evidence of additional, unrelated crimes by targets of his or her investigation. Rather than leaving the issue to argument and misunderstanding as to whether the new matters are included within a vague category of "related matters," the regulations clarify that the decision as to which component would handle such new matters would be made by the Attorney General. The Special Counsel would report such matters to the Attorney General, and the Attorney General would decide whether to grant the Special

Counsel jurisdiction over the additional matters.

“(c) Civil and Administrative Jurisdiction. If in the course of his or her investigation the Special Counsel determines that administrative remedies, civil sanctions or other governmental action outside the criminal justice system might be appropriate, he or she shall consult with the Attorney General with respect to the appropriate component to take any necessary action. A Special Counsel shall not have civil or administrative authority unless specifically granted such jurisdiction by the Attorney General.”

Discussion:

Paragraph (c) is intended to clarify that the Special Counsel's jurisdiction will cover only the criminal aspects of the matters within his or her jurisdiction, unless other jurisdiction is specifically granted by the Attorney General.

Section 600.5. Staff

“A Special Counsel may request the assignment of appropriate Department employees to assist the Special Counsel. The Department shall gather and provide the Special Counsel with the names and resumes of appropriate personnel available for detail. The Special Counsel may also request the detail of specific employees, and the office for which the designated employee works shall make reasonable efforts to accommodate the request. The Special Counsel shall assign the duties and supervise the work of such employees while they are assigned to the Special Counsel. If necessary, the Special Counsel may request that additional personnel be hired or assigned from outside the Department. All personnel in the Department shall cooperate to the fullest extent possible with the Special Counsel.”

Discussion:

This provision, providing for the assignment of appropriate personnel to assist the Special Counsel, also includes assignment of needed investigative resources from the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It is anticipated that most personnel will be Department of Justice employees provided by detail to the Special Counsel, although the regulation provides for additional employment from outside the Department when necessary.

Section 600.6. Powers and Authority

“Subject to the limitations in the following paragraphs, the Special Counsel shall exercise, within the scope of his or her jurisdiction, the full power and independent authority to exercise all investigative and prosecutorial functions of any United States Attorney. Except as provided in this part, the Special Counsel shall determine whether and to what extent to inform or consult with the Attorney General or others within the Department about the conduct of his or her duties and responsibilities.”

Section 600.7. Conduct and Accountability

“(a) A Special Counsel shall comply with the rules, regulations, procedures, practices and policies of the Department of Justice. He or she shall consult with appropriate offices within the Department for guidance with respect to established practices, policies and procedures of the Department, including ethics and security regulations and procedures. Should the Special Counsel conclude that the extraordinary circumstances of any particular decision would render compliance with required review and approval procedures by the designated Departmental component inappropriate, he or she may consult directly with the Attorney General.”

Mr. NADLER. I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, that one reason for this resolution, given the fact that Mr. Barr, the Attorney General, has, in

fact, said that he would want to release as much as possible—and we appreciate that statement—but he and Mr. Rosenstein, the Deputy Attorney General, as I mentioned in my opening remarks, have both cited the Department policy not to comment on the conduct of someone not indicted.

That leads us to expect that a misapplication of the normal Department policy to a sitting President of not commenting on someone who is not indicted, the application of that normally good policy to a sitting President who the Department believes cannot be indicted because he is a sitting President, would, in fact, greatly limit the ability of the Department or the willingness of the Department to release information in the report to the Congress and to the public.

One of the reasons for this resolution is that we want to say, no, you cannot use that normally salutary policy to convert the Department's policy of never indicting a sitting President into a coverup that you can't comment or give to the Congress information about that.

If you can't indict a sitting President and you can't give the information to Congress, then you are holding the President above the law, and you are frustrating Congress' ability to do its job of holding an administration accountable.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD).

□ 1000

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his indulgence.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution because I want the whole truth and nothing but the truth to come to light in this matter; I want to know what Vladimir Putin did to our electoral process; I want to know the failures of the Obama administration in reacting to this attack in real time; I want any Americans complicit to face severe consequences; and I want the American people to know as much as they can and see as much as they can.

As a member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I support the efforts and the request for all information pertaining to this investigation to be open to the public. That includes all witness lists, every interview transcript, and every document provided.

The taxpayers paid millions for this information, and they should get to see all of it and not just the assessment of one person.

This resolution should have been broader; it should have been deeper; and it should have covered everything dealing with the investigation. But it is a step in the right direction.

I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle accept the calls for all the information to be made public because full transparency is the only way to prevent future speculation. Full transparency is the only way to prevent future innuendo.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say thank you to the chairman. I appreciate it. Mr. HURD was on his way over here. I did my best song and dance. It didn't last long enough. I am from the South. I am bad because I can't dance that well. So I appreciate the gentleman giving him that moment.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, for all the reasons stated by all the people who spoke in favor of this resolution, myself and everyone else, I urge adoption of the resolution. I urge everyone to vote for it. It is a very important resolution to maintain the rule of law in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 208, the previous question is ordered on the concurrent resolution and preamble, as amended.

The question is on adoption of the concurrent resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the concurrent resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 0, answered “present” 4, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 125]

YEAS—420

Abraham	Brooks (AL)	Clyburn
Adams	Brooks (IN)	Cohen
Aderholt	Brown (MD)	Cole
Aguilar	Brownley (CA)	Collins (GA)
Allen	Buchanan	Collins (NY)
Allred	Buck	Comer
Amodei	Bucshon	Conaway
Armstrong	Budd	Connolly
Arrington	Burchett	Cook
Axne	Burgess	Cooper
Babin	Bustos	Correa
Bacon	Butterfield	Costa
Baird	Byrne	Courtney
Balderson	Calvert	Cox (CA)
Banks	Carbajal	Craig
Barr	Cárdenas	Crawford
Barragán	Carson (IN)	Crenshaw
Bass	Carter (GA)	Crist
Beatty	Carter (TX)	Crow
Bera	Cartwright	Cuellar
Bergman	Case	Cummings
Beyer	Casten (IL)	Cunningham
Biggs	Castor (FL)	Curtis
Bilirakis	Castro (TX)	Davids (KS)
Bishop (GA)	Chabot	Davidson (OH)
Bishop (UT)	Cheney	Davis (CA)
Blumenauer	Chu, Judy	Davis, Danny K.
Blunt Rochester	Cicilline	Davis, Rodney
Bonamici	Cisneros	Dean
Bost	Clark (MA)	DeFazio
Boyle, Brendan	Clarke (NY)	DeGette
F.	Clay	DeLauro
Brady	Cline	DeBene
Brindisi	Cloud	Delgado

Demings Kelly (PA)
 DeSaulnier Kennedy
 DesJarlais Khanna
 Deutch Kildee
 Diaz-Balart Kilmer
 Dingell Kim
 Doggett Kind
 Doyle, Michael King (IA)
 F. King (NY)
 Duffy Kinzinger
 Duncan Kirkpatrick
 Dunn Krishnamoorthi
 Emmer Kuster (NH)
 Engel Kustoff (TN)
 Escobar LaHood
 Eshoo LaMalfa
 Espaillat Lamb
 Estes Lamborn
 Evans Langevin
 Ferguson Larsen (WA)
 Finkenauer Larson (CT)
 Fitzpatrick Latta
 Fleischmann Lawrence
 Fletcher Lawson (FL)
 Flores Lee (CA)
 Fortenberry Lee (NV)
 Foster Lesko
 Foxx (NC) Levin (CA)
 Frankel Levin (MI)
 Fudge Lewis
 Fulcher Lieu, Ted
 Gabbard Lipinski
 Gallagher Loeb sack
 Gallego Long
 Garamendi Loudermilk
 Garcia (IL) Lowenthal
 Garcia (TX) Lowey
 Gianforte Lucas
 Gibbs Luetkemeyer
 Gohmert Luján
 Golden Luria
 Gomez Lynch
 Gonzalez (OH) Malinowski
 Gonzalez (TX) Maloney,
 Gooden Carolyn B.
 Gottheimer Maloney, Sean
 Granger Marchant
 Graves (GA) Mast
 Graves (LA) Matsui
 Graves (MO) McAdams
 Green (TN) McBath
 Green (TX) McCarthy
 Griffith McCaul
 Grijalva McClintock
 Grothman McCollum
 Guest McGovern
 Guthrie McHenry
 Haaland McKinley
 Hagedorn McNeerney
 Harder (CA) Meadows
 Harris Meeks
 Hartzler Meng
 Hayes Meuser
 Heck Miller
 Hern, Kevin Mitchell
 Herrera Beutler Moolenaar
 Hice (GA) Mooney (WV)
 Higgins (LA) Moore
 Higgins (NY) Morelle
 Hill (AR) Moulton
 Hill (CA) Mucarsel-Powell
 Himes Mullin
 Holding Murphy
 Hollingsworth Nadler
 Horn, Kendra S. Napolitano
 Horsford Neal
 Houlahan Neguse
 Hoyer Newhouse
 Hudson Norcross
 Huffman Norman
 Huizenga Nunes
 Hunter O'Halleran
 Hurd (TX) Ocasio-Cortez
 Jackson Lee Olson
 Jayapal Omar
 Jeffries Palazzo
 Johnson (GA) Pallone
 Johnson (LA) Palmer
 Johnson (OH) Panetta
 Johnson (SD) Pappas
 Johnson (TX) Pascrell
 Jordan Payne
 Joyce (OH) Pence
 Joyce (PA) Perlmutter
 Kaptur
 Katko
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kelly (MS)

Pocan
 Porter
 Posey
 Pressley
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Raskin
 Reed
 Reschenthaler
 Rice (NY)
 Rice (SC)
 Richmond
 Rigglesman
 Roby
 Rodgers (WA)
 Roe, David P.
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rooney (FL)
 Rose (NY)
 Rose, John W.
 Rouda
 Rouzer
 Roy
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Rutherford
 Ryan
 Sánchez
 Sarbanes
 Scalise
 Scanlon
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Schrier
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Shalala
 Sherman
 Sherrill
 Shimkus
 Simpson
 Sires
 Slotkin
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Smucker
 Soto
 Spanberger
 Spano
 Speier
 Stanton
 Stauber
 Stefanik
 Steil
 Steube
 Stevens
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Suozzi
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Taylor
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Timmons
 Tipton
 Titus
 Tlaib
 Tonko
 Torres (CA)
 Torres Small
 (NM)
 Trahan
 Trone
 Turner
 Underwood
 Upton
 Van Drew
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden

Walker
 Walorski
 Waltz
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watkins
 Watson Coleman
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Welch
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Weston
 Wild
 Williams
 Wilson (FL)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Wright
 Yarmuth
 Yoho
 Young
 Zeldin

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4

NOT VOTING—7

□ 1030

Messrs. BRADY and BUCK changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. GAETZ changed his vote from "yea" to "present."

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I regrettably missed votes on Thursday, March 14, 2019. I had intended to vote "yes" on rollcall vote No. 125.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from the House floor during today's rollcall vote on H. Con. Res. 24. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 125.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 2019, TO MONDAY, MARCH 18, 2019

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday, March 18, 2019.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1004

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove Representative TOM RICE as a cosponsor from H.R. 1004.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is advised that a unanimous consent request for the consideration of that measure would have to receive clearance from the majority and the minority floor and committee leaderships.

The Chair is unaware at this time of any such clearance. Therefore, the Chair cannot and will not entertain that request at this time.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I urge to immediately schedule this important bill.

DOMESTIC AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE

(Ms. DEAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. DEAN. Mr. Speaker, domestic violence is an insidious problem that affects far too many people across our country.

One in four women and one in seven men will be the victim of violence by an intimate partner in their lifetime.

Sadly, the scourge of domestic and sexual violence affects our communities, our schools, our servicemembers, and threatens the well-being of women, men, children, the LGBTQ community, our veterans, and others.

But through education and legislative action like reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act, or VAWA, we can and have made a difference.

Since its passage 25 years ago through 2012, the rate of domestic violence decreased by 63 percent. From 1996 to 2015, the rate of women murdered by men in a single-victim/single-offender incident dropped by 29 percent.

This week, we voted in the Judiciary Committee to reauthorize this life-saving legislation.

I look forward to bringing VAWA to the floor so that families may be protected from the tragedy of domestic and sexual violence; so that young women like my granddaughter, Aubrey, feel safe to focus on the things that are most important, like claiming her education, her career, and her happy life ahead of her.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this important legislation.

RECOGNIZING JEANNETTE RANKIN DURING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

(Mr. GIANFORTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a trailblazing Montanan as we celebrate Women's History Month.

A fearless, principled leader, Jeannette Rankin was a courageous pioneer. The daughter of a rancher and a teacher, she was born and raised in Montana. Growing up, she helped on her family's ranch and, in 1902, graduated from what is now the University of Montana.

As a staunch advocate for women's suffrage, she successfully led efforts to secure women the right to vote in Montana in 1914, 6 years before the 19th Amendment to our Constitution was ratified.

Four years before women could vote throughout our Nation, Montanans elected Jeannette Rankin to Congress. She was the first woman to serve in this body.

Dedicated to her guiding principles, Jeannette Rankin is foundational to Montana's and our country's history. It is my distinct honor to recognize her for her lasting contributions to our country during Women's History Month.

SHED LIGHT ON DARK MONEY

(Ms. SCANLON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, last week the House passed H.R. 1, the For the People Act, a sweeping voting rights and government reform package that returns the power of our democracy to the American people.

Since this week is Sunshine Week, I want to focus on a particular part of H.R. 1 that is designed to shine some much-needed sunshine on the corrosive influence of dark money.

Multiple sources reported this week that the President's 2017 inaugural fund received tens of thousands of dollars in contributions from shell companies to conceal illegal contributions from foreign donors.

Think about that. Foreign agents lavished tens of thousands of dollars on the U.S. inaugural celebration so they could try to influence our President.

That is why I introduced the Inaugural Fund Integrity Act, which is part of H.R. 1, to close loopholes in the existing regulations, to put an end to donations by foreign nationals and corporations, to ban personal use of inaugural funds, and to require disclosure of all donations and spending by inaugural committees.

It is hard to think of an area more in need of sunshine than a shadowy slush fund rife with opportunities for government corruption.

COMMUNITY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1695, the Community Services Block Grant Reauthorization Act of 2019.

This bill renews our Nation's commitment to reducing poverty through locally driven, comprehensive approaches.

I am proud to lead this legislation with Congresswoman BETTY MCCOLLUM.

Mr. Speaker, the Community Services Block Grant traces its roots back more than 50 years ago to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. This act established local committee action agencies to help people identify why people were in poverty and how to address it using public and private resources and partnerships.

Virtually every county in America has a community action agency. They act as a safety net for low-income individuals and families, but, more importantly, they help to create opportunities to raise people out of poverty—from poverty to independence.

The Community Services Block Grant is the only Federal program with the explicit goal of reducing poverty, regardless of its cause. Unfortunately, this program has not been reauthorized in more than 20 years, which is unacceptable.

It is time to reauthorize the Community Services Block Grant, and I urge all my colleagues to cosponsor and support this bill.

RIISING FOR MOLLY

(Ms. HOULAHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HOULAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise for my Molly.

I stand here on the floor of the House of Representatives as a proud mother of a gay daughter.

When I was in the Air Force, we were taught never to leave anyone behind; and, after the 2016 election, I listened as my daughter, my Molly, cried in my arms.

She was scared for her community, the LGBTQ community. She was scared that America had left her and her community behind.

This is and was the country that I served. This was the daughter that I have raised. I was scared too.

When we decided, as a family, to run for Congress, Molly and I spoke about her story and whether she was comfortable with me sharing it with our Nation. We agreed that it was important.

As a mother, an ally, and now a Member of Congress, I feel it my duty and my privilege to champion the voices of those in the LGBTQ community.

I am proud to cosponsor the Equality Act. I do so for my daughter—my Molly—for my community, the Pennsylvania 6th, and for all of my fellow LGBTQ Americans.

You will not be left behind.

BMW CREATES JOBS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it was reported last week that the BMW plant in South Carolina remained the top vehicle exporter in America, with more than \$8.4 billion worth of cars shipped to foreign countries.

Nearly a quarter of a million cars were exported, with the vast majority sent from the Port of Charleston, led by State Ports Authority President Jim Newsome.

Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago, the late Governor Carroll Campbell recruited BMW to South Carolina with export production of 1,400 cars a day. Production in 2018 was 356,749 vehicles.

Governor Henry McMaster and Commerce Secretary Bobby Hitt continue to promote an additional \$600 million investment in Plant Spartanburg, which already at \$10 billion is the largest BMW plant in the world, providing 11,000 jobs.

Thousands of additional jobs in the region have been created by suppliers to the assembly facility.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

□ 1045

WISHING SUPREME COURT JUSTICE RUTH BADER GINSBURG A HAPPY 86TH BIRTHDAY

(Ms. BARRAGÁN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg and to wish her a happy 86th birthday this Friday.

During this Women's History Month, we celebrate visionary women like Justice Ginsburg, whose work ethic and achievements have motivated me and many women across this country.

Throughout her career, Justice Ginsburg has been a pioneer for gender equality. As a first-year Harvard Law student, she was one of nine women in a 500-person class and became the first female professor to have tenure at Columbia.

She would later cofound the ACLU's Women's Rights Project, paving the way for groundbreaking work around issues like pregnancy and parenting, education equity and equal pay.

Undoubtedly, Justice Ginsburg has set a precedent for women everywhere and continues to do so as a Supreme Court Justice.

I wish Justice Ginsburg many more years of health and happiness. She truly is an American hero.

COMMEMORATING DR. JOHN BARDO

(Mr. ESTES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ESTES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Wichita State University President Dr. John Bardo, who sadly passed away on March 12, 2019. In his 7 years as president, Dr. Bardo's devotion to education and Wichita State was unsurpassed as he led the university in a bold direction that benefited students and the entire Wichita community.

Dr. Bardo's tenure was not his first job at the university. In 1975, Dr. Bardo, then an assistant professor of sociology, met his wife, Deborah.

When Dr. Bardo returned to Wichita State as president in 2012, he said: "We came home . . . to reposition this university as a key driver of the future of Wichita." From developing the Innovation Campus and WSU Tech, to increasing online courses, research, and dorm space, his leadership accomplished that goal and set the university on a path to be a nationwide leader in education.

Last July, Dr. Bardo was invited to come testify before the House Education and the Workforce Committee about Wichita State's leadership in innovation. As a member of the committee at the time, I will never forget the pride Dr. Bardo showed for the university and our community.

I know Shockers are better off because of his leadership, passion, and vision.

I ask my colleagues to join me in praying for the Bardo family.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF VICTOR MCELHANEY

(Ms. LEE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Victor McElhaney, the son of my friend, Oakland City Councilwoman Lynette McElhaney, and his father, Clarence, and to offer my deepest condolences on behalf of the 13th Congressional District.

Victor was tragically slain in a senseless act of gun violence early Sunday morning in Los Angeles. He was killed in a robbery attempt while heading home from a friend's house.

Victor was just 21 years old and a senior at the University of Southern California's Thornton School of Music, where he was pursuing his lifelong love of music. He was a talented drummer and was often playing at jam sessions, displaying his musical genius.

Victor was a son of Oakland, and his passing is a loss for Oakland and the entire East Bay community. My heart is heavy for Lynette and her family and all those who loved and cared for Victor.

Victor was killed in Los Angeles, but his murder reflects the epidemic of gun violence in my district and all around the country, especially communities of color. Even before Victor's tragic passing, combating gun violence in Oakland was a priority for his mother as a city council member.

May God comfort Victor's family as we mourn his loss. May his spirit lead and guide us in the work that we must do to end gun violence in his memory.

May Victor's legacy live, and may he rest in peace.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF CAPTAIN JAKE RINGERING

(Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of Captain Jake Ringering, a beloved member of the Godfrey Fire Protection District who tragically lost his life in the line of duty on March 5.

While responding to a fire in Bethalto, members of the Godfrey Fire Protection District were attempting to suppress the fire from outside when the building partially collapsed. Captain Ringering and Firefighter Luke Warner both sustained injuries from the collapse.

Captain Ringering served as a firefighter for more than 18 years, beginning with the East Alton Fire Department before joining the Godfrey Fire Department in 2010. He was promoted to captain in May 2014.

The Godfrey fire chief described him as "gold" and leaving a legacy that will be remembered for a long time. Godfrey's mayor, and my friend, Mike McCormick, said his passing leaves "hard boots to fill."

Captain Ringering is survived by his wife and three young children. Please join me in keeping his family, as well as the Godfrey community, in your thoughts and prayers.

OPPOSING PRESIDENT TRUMP'S BUDGET PROPOSAL

(Mr. McADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. McADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the President's budget proposal, which would increase the Federal deficit from \$779 billion in 2018 to \$1.1 trillion in 2020. If the goal is to rein in deficits and debt, this budget represents epic failure.

I am a public servant who takes seriously the responsibility of spending other people's money. As a freshman Member of the Congress, the current deficit hole we have dug for ourselves wasn't my doing, but I was elected to solve problems, not make them worse.

America's \$22 trillion debt is a bipartisan problem. Democrats and Republicans have acted in a way that suggests that debt doesn't matter. But

Utahns know that if it was their small business with books so badly out of balance, they would soon be out of business.

Our government has been living beyond its means for years, and I believe it is wrong for one generation to forever burden generations yet to come.

As a former mayor who had to balance, in bipartisan fashion, a budget every year, I know these choices aren't easy. But it is our job to roll up our sleeves, come together, and work out a budget that takes serious steps toward reducing the dangerous, unsustainable levels of debt in our country. Those steps are not in the President's budget.

CONGRATULATING FIRST SERGEANT IAN MCCLURE

(Ms. CHENEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate First Sergeant Ian McClure, U.S. Army, for being named the 2018 Allied Command Operations Military Member of the Year.

A 2003 graduate of East High School in Cheyenne, Wyoming, First Sergeant McClure went on to serve in the Army Special Forces in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Mali, and he is now stationed at NATO Special Operations headquarters in Belgium.

First Sergeant McClure was selected for this award because of his superior performance and professional excellence. I am proud that General Scaparrotti recognized First Sergeant McClure's significant contributions to the success of alliance operations.

Sergeant McClure exemplifies the best that Wyoming and our country has to offer, and I thank him for his service and his sacrifices for our freedom.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to congratulate First Sergeant Ian McClure on this prestigious honor and for being a brilliant example for the entire State of Wyoming.

MAINLAND REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS BASKETBALL STATE CHAMPIONS

(Mr. VAN DREW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me to honor some outstanding members of south Jersey. The Mainland Regional High School Girls Basketball team has recently won the New Jersey Group 3 State championship. This is the first time the Mainland Regional High School girls basketball team has achieved this amazing accomplishment.

These girls are the embodiment of teamwork. This win, and the hard work that they have put in to achieve it, is about all of them, not any one individual. I have been told that some of

them have been best friends since they were 7 years old.

This friendship and teamwork have led them to reach an amazing goal. We could all learn a little bit about teamwork, especially in this great House of ours, and we could learn it from these amazing young ladies.

Congratulations to the Mainland Regional High School girls basketball team. Keep up the good work. We are really proud of you.

REMEMBERING THE EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SYRIAN CONFLICT

(Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today in remembrance of the eighth anniversary of the Syrian conflict, which resulted in the tragic loss of many human lives and the destabilization of the entire region.

This is all because of the dictator Bashar Assad, who is unwilling to step aside and heed the Syrian people's call for freedom. After destroying Syria, Assad is now attempting to attract economic investment. But in addition to killing over 400,000 Syrians of the Muslim faith, Assad has also failed to protect the religious minority of Christians in Syria.

Having personally met with the Syrian Christians for Peace, I have heard firsthand how Assad repeatedly targeted Syria's most vulnerable populations.

Few Christians continue to live in Assad's Syria, due to brutality by pro-Assad militias. That is why we must support the Trump administration's isolation of the regime and its allies in Tehran and Moscow. That is why the Senate must follow the House and pass the Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act.

SUPPORTING THE EQUALITY ACT

(Ms. HAALAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Equality Act.

America must live up to its values, and that means treating everyone as equals and ending discrimination. The Equality Act is about making sure all Americans, regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity, can participate in our society without fear.

New Mexico is home to diverse religious and traditional communities and has stood up for its LGBTQ population for a long time. We stood up early to ban the cruel practice of conversion therapy.

The Equality Act allows us to adhere to our faiths while prohibiting harmful and isolating acts of discrimination experienced by too many LGBTQ Americans.

Consider this: 38 percent of transgender New Mexicans are unem-

ployed; 40 percent live in poverty; 26 percent have been discriminated against during the hiring or promotion processes; 41 percent have been homeless at some point; and 33 percent have been discriminated against at a place of public accommodation.

No one should have to worry about being discriminated against when planning their wedding or struggle to simply get a cake. The Equality Act will outlaw such discrimination, which is why we should pass it as soon as possible.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF MAYOR NANCY SHAVER

(Mr. RUTHERFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize Mayor Nancy Shaver and her tenure of dedicated service to the citizens of St. Augustine, Florida. A strong advocate for the Nation's oldest city, Mayor Shaver recently stepped down from her position with an admirable record of leadership in her community.

Mayor Shaver, who previously served as a teacher and businesswoman, was elected to office in 2014. During her time as mayor, she was a tireless advocate for important issues that are very unique to the city of St. Augustine. It was my honor to work with her in the effort to combat sea level rise to protect our coastal economies and safeguard the priceless historical and cultural features that make St. Augustine so special.

As mayor, she exemplified the virtues of local government by putting citizens, not politics, first and remaining devoted to the northeast Florida community.

I thank Nancy Shaver for her commitment to the city of St. Augustine and our fellow citizens, for whom she so dearly cared. I wish her and her family the best in their future endeavors.

OPPOSITION TO USING FEDERAL FUNDS TO ARM TEACHERS

(Mrs. HAYES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to the idea of using Federal funds to arm teachers. This issue has haunted me from the moment it was first discussed after the tragedy at Sandy Hook Elementary School to more recently when it was revisited after the Parkland shooting.

Seventy-three percent of teachers do not want this. More than 60 percent of parents do not want this. And the majority of students do not want this.

Since 1999, in 225 incidents of school campus gun violence, armed personnel failed to disarm a shooter 223 times.

I came to Congress from the classroom. As a teacher, I would never want

the responsibility of securing a firearm in a school. I understand how this would drastically change the school culture and make it feel more like a prison.

As the wife of a police officer, I understand the training that is involved with the responsibility of owning a firearm, and I know that school districts cannot manage that. I could never imagine explaining to a parent that it was my firearm that accidentally injured their child.

I recognize that many local school communities are still trying to decide where they fall on this conversation, yet I cannot overstress the point that Federal funds should not be diverted from student learning outcomes to arm teachers.

This is why, today, I have introduced a resolution to prohibit the use of Federal funds to arm teachers.

□ 1100

GRAHAM CREEK BRIDGE

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with a strong background in the industry, I understand the vital role freight rail plays in getting Hoosier-made and Hoosier-grown products to the market.

Short line freight rail makes up nearly 30 percent of all freight rail, allowing rural communities like those across Indiana's Sixth District to play an integral role in our economy. One such line is the Madison Railroad, which provides exclusive access to the national rail network for many Hoosiers in southeastern Indiana.

The city of Madison is working to obtain Federal grant funding to replace the 100-year-plus Graham Creek Bridge, critical infrastructure that keeps the Madison Railroad safely operating and serving our community.

Built in the 19th century, the current structure poses an immediate safety risk and cannot accommodate heavy commercial freight loads. Replacement of this bridge will benefit southeast Indiana by removing a potential safety risk and creating jobs and economic opportunity for Hoosiers.

Mr. Speaker, we are proud of the historic architecture throughout Indiana, and the Graham Creek Bridge has been an iconic landmark that extends over the beautiful Muscatatuck River. I hope my colleagues in this Chamber can join me in supporting this infrastructure project.

RECOGNIZING RAQUEL GUERRERO

(Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, during Women's History Month, I rise

to honor the life and legacy of Raquel Guerrero, a woman who immigrated as a child to Chicago's Pilsen community and who dedicated her life to make it a better place for her family and for all families.

She was instrumental in improving opportunities and demanding more resources and better education for the mostly Latino students in my district.

She understood the value of a good education for children, but it extended beyond books, and advocated for healthy hot meals for students at what is now known as the Pilsen Community Academy, where I had my first years of schooling.

She helped establish Pilsen's annual Fiesta del Sol, the largest community festival in the Midwest.

Raquel was instrumental in securing funds to build the new Benito Juarez Community Academy High School in Pilsen, which has since provided many generations of young people with good public education.

She helped found APO, the Association for Workers Rights, a workers' rights group that still operates in the community.

Raquel's organizing efforts also resulted in the funding of the Rudy Lozano Library in Pilsen.

She was the mother of 11, but treated every child in the community as a part of her family.

Mr. Speaker, we honor her during Women's History Month.

REMEMBERING THE HONORABLE LOUISE SLAUGHTER

(Mr. NEWHOUSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe that it has been almost a year since we lost our beloved colleague, the Honorable Louise Slaughter.

Louise always believed personal relationships could transcend politics. She set an example for us all through her acts of kindness, particularly with those of us in the other party.

We bonded as members of an exclusive club, a club I wish upon no one: those of us who have lost our spouses. Somehow she made me feel like I was helping her through the loss of her husband when, in fact, she, being much smarter than I, knew that, through my attempts to help her, she was really helping me through the loss of my wife.

It was recently announced that Louise, the first female chair of the House Rules Committee, would be inducted into the National Women's Hall of Fame. What a deserving honor.

I will always appreciate my friendship with the Honorable Louise Slaughter and will never forget the efforts she made to take me under her wing from across the political aisle.

FOR THE PEOPLE AGENDA

(Mr. CARTWRIGHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remind this House of the Democratic For the People agenda, which starts with rebuilding American infrastructure and creating good paying jobs doing so.

It includes expanding healthcare so that it is available to more and more Americans, and bringing down the costs of healthcare and prescription drugs.

It includes cleaning up our American democracy and rooting out corruption in our electoral process.

We achieved the third one this month with H.R. 1, the For the People Act, but the other two took a serious blow this week when we saw the President's budget, which cuts Medicare to the tune of \$1.5 trillion over the next 10 years, breaking a core promise of the President's campaign, and also cuts infrastructure spending.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject that shortsightedness in the President's budget, and let's go ahead and achieve the For the People agenda.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO DAVID LEON LOYA

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to David Leon Loya. This is a young man who was full of life.

David loved life and enjoyed something that many of us have participated in and that we see more Americans doing across the Nation, and that is bicycling. He was an avid bicyclist and enjoyed the outdoors in Houston, Texas.

He was a young man with a future before him with a loving family.

He was a young man that we want to pay tribute to because we know that he exhibited values of love and generosity, because of the community who came out to express their remorse and their sadness that he lost his life while bicycling.

We understand, in tribute to him, recognizing that as the world changes, more Americans will be riding their bicycle. We want to make sure, in his name, that we have designed bicycle paths, that in the urban areas they cover streets in a lighted way so that vehicles can acknowledge those on bicycles and that they can be protected.

David Leon Loya, we honor him and love him. In his name, Mr. Speaker, we will make these bicycle paths the best and the most safe, and he will not have died in vain.

To his family, my deepest sympathy.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TRONE) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 14, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a letter from Mr. Josh Lawson, General Counsel, North Carolina State Board of Elections, indicating that a special election has been ordered for the Ninth Congressional District of North Carolina.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON.

Enclosure.

NORTH CAROLINA,
STATE BOARD OF ELECTIONS,
March 13, 2019.

Re Notification of Order of new election in Ninth Congressional District of the State of North Carolina.

Hon. CHERYL L. JOHNSON,
Clerk of the House of Representatives, c/o Tom Wickham, Parliamentarian.

DEAR MADAM CLERK: The North Carolina State Board of Elections today entered a written Order directing a new election in our State's Ninth Congressional District. The Order, which was separately with your Office, established the following special election calendar, including a primary required by State law:

Primary election: May 14, 2019;

Second primary (if necessary): September 10, 2019;

General election (if no second primary): September 10, 2019; and

General election (if second primary): November 5, 2019.

Our State greatly appreciates all actions that may be authorized by your Office to enable ongoing provision of services to residents within the District.

Sincerely,

JOSH LAWSON,
General Counsel.

EQUALITY FOR THE LGBTQ COMMUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. PAPPAS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, there are times in Washington that go beyond the mundane, times when you can feel the pull of public sentiment and the weight of history, times that aren't political but become personal. For some of us who serve here and for millions more around the country, this is one of those times.

Yesterday, I was proud to join so many Members of this House to introduce the Equality Act. This bill will ensure full equality under the law for the LGBTQ community, an essential step, given that Americans can still be

fired or discriminated against in nearly 30 States.

We have made marked progress over recent decades, no doubt, but full equality for LGBTQ Americans still lies somewhere over the horizon.

We are not asking for anything more or anything less than any other American enjoys. We are asking to be treated equally, and we are asking for it right now.

I grew up afraid about whether I would be accepted by the world around me and convinced I wouldn't be able to live a full life. This is, unfortunately, a reality today for too many LGBTQ Americans. Too many still live in fear of sharing their truth or telling their stories. Too many contend with injustice because of who they are or whom they love.

There is injustice when more than 4 million workers could face the risk of employment discrimination in this country.

There is injustice when more than 2 million students are left without protections against bullying, harassment, and roadblocks on their path to an education.

There is injustice when nearly 7 million Americans could be subject to discrimination in public accommodations.

There is injustice when 5½ million Americans could be denied equal opportunities to secure housing or credit.

This is heartbreaking. This is not what America stands for, and we can do something about it.

We can take action to support the values and the Constitution of this Nation.

We can take action that will protect the safety and well-being of millions and tell everyone, particularly the LGBTQ youth, that they can reach their full potential.

We can take action and pass the Equality Act.

The Equality Act will end these injustices and establish equality under the law by enshrining sexual orientation and gender identity language into the Civil Rights Act, the Fair Housing Act, the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, and the Jury Selection and Services Act.

We must address this at the Federal level. Equality and human dignity are not concepts that can be left up to the States. Americans who live in Nebraska deserve the same civil rights protections as those living in my home State of New Hampshire. The same goes for those living in Mississippi and in Massachusetts.

The end of discrimination can only begin when we protect our fellow citizens in each and every community across this Nation.

Since Stonewall, millions of LGBTQ Americans have come out and have told their stories. Many have done so at great personal risk, but with a great societal benefit.

Coming out and living openly has done more to change hearts, minds, and laws than anything else. As a re-

sult, we now stand on the cusp of history and of full equality, with the American people and public opinion squarely behind us.

Mr. Speaker, as the people's House considers this bill, I ask my colleagues a simple question: Who deserves to be treated as a second-class citizen just for being who we are? Which Members of this body, which people in your districts, which people in your own lives deserve to be less than equal?

Mr. Speaker, I hope this House gets it right. Full equality under the law—nothing less, nothing more. It is a simple concept; it is a beautiful concept; and it is also an American concept.

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of the LGBTQ Americans today, for future generations, let's pass H.R. 5, the Equality Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1115

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, as most Members are heading back home, I was reminded in the elevator of someone who said: Well, you know, you guys are getting off this week. I have told friends and some of the media that you guys take vacations all the time.

I explained: You don't want us in session every day. Every day we are in session, we pass something that could be law restraining you in furtherance of your freedoms.

It is a good thing when Members of Congress go home, as most of us do. It is tougher for those on the West Coast, but most of us go home each weekend during recesses or maybe a quick trip to speak here or there just outside of the district. But it is a good thing for Members of Congress to go home and to hear from people back home. That is good. Anyway, sometimes the rigors at home are even more than we face here.

There are at least three things I want to address today. One of them is information that has come out.

I was there for a number of the depositions that were taken behind closed doors of witnesses—formerly from the Justice Department, some still with the Justice Department—regarding what Gregg Jarrett called “The Russia Hoax,” and he documents why that sounds like an appropriate title.

There is an article from FOX News about this by Gregg Re. This quoted Lisa Page. She was an interesting witness. It was interesting watching her testify.

As a former judge who has tried a tremendous number of cases in Federal court, State court, and military court, it is interesting watching people testify. Most you can get a little tell when

they are being dishonest, but it has been amazing to me, especially since I have been in Congress, how many people can look you in the eye and lie. You know they are lying; they know they are lying; and often you can see they don't care. People like that are often able to pass polygraph tests because you have got to have a conscience. You cannot have numbed your conscience to the point that you are not affected by your own lying anymore.

Lisa Page's presentation as she testified was tremendously different from Peter Strzok as he testified behind closed doors. It was amazing to watch that guy. Because of his answers, I knew he was lying. And it appeared to me that there were no tells, that he just didn't seem to be bothered by the fact and that he could sit there and lie under oath. I thought perhaps he would be a great candidate to pass a lie detector test when he is lying.

But then somebody told me, actually, he failed two lie detector tests in the FBI, but somebody like Lisa Page removed those from his file. It is great to have friends to help you out when you do wrong and they can cover for you.

And I am being sarcastic, for friends who cannot figure that out.

But the article points out that former FBI lawyer, Lisa Page, testified: “The FBI was ordered by the Obama DOJ not to consider charging Hillary Clinton for gross negligence in the handling of classified information.”

It goes on and says: “Page's testimony was perhaps the most salient evidence yet that the Justice Department improperly interfered with the FBI's supposedly independent conclusions on Clinton's criminal culpability”—well, stating that that came from JOHN RATCLIFFE, a colleague of ours from Texas, here in Congress. He was questioning her, and he says: “But when you say advice you got from the Department, you're making it sound like it was the Department”—talking about the Department of Justice—“that told you: You're not going to charge gross negligence because we're the prosecutors and we're telling you we're not going to—”

And Lisa Page interrupted and said: “That is correct.”

Lisa Page also testified that “the DOJ and FBI had multiple conversations . . . about charging gross negligence,” and the DOJ decided that the term was “constitutionally vague,” which is really interesting because as a judge, as a lawyer, I tried cases in which gross negligence was alleged. I am not aware of any court case ever indicating that gross negligence was unconstitutional vague. Maybe there is a case that says that. I am not aware of one.

But if there were to be one from the Supreme Court, then there would be massive criminal and civil judgments that would be due to be undone and be reversed because most lawyers who have done any research, tried any

cases, or done adequate reading know that the term “gross negligence” is not unconstitutionally vague, nor is it negligence.

Now, different States in the Federal Government may have slightly different definitions of negligence and gross negligence, but they are substantially the same. It has just never been a problem with constitutional vagueness from the term “gross negligence.”

Understanding that, it would bring one to the conclusion, if Lisa Page is correct, that the prosecutors in the Obama Justice Department were saying Hillary Clinton was grossly negligent handling classified material but gross negligence is too vague so we are not going to charge her, then it shows one of two things: the Obama DOJ had some of the most ignorant lawyers in the country working there, or the Obama DOJ had some exceedingly dishonest lawyers working there. You choose.

Going back to the article, it says: “In July 2016, then-FBI Director James Comey”—parenthetically, I would insert, another real peach—“publicly announced at a bombshell press conference that Clinton had been ‘extremely careless’ in handling classified information. . . . Federal law states that gross negligence in handling the Nation’s intelligence can be punished criminally with prison time or fines, and there is no requirement that defendants act intentionally. . . . Originally, Comey accused the former Secretary of State of being ‘grossly negligent’—using that term ‘grossly negligent’—‘in handling classified information in a draft dated May 2, 2016, but that was modified to claim that Clinton had merely been ‘extremely careless’ in a draft dated June 10, 2016.”

Comey also said: “Although there is evidence of potential violations of the statutes regarding the handling of classified information”—I mean, I am sure the guy from the Navy that snapped a few pictures on a submarine and had absolutely no ill intent whatsoever, though he apparently was acting recklessly and ended up doing prison time, I am sure he would love to know that there was such a high standard applied to Hillary Clinton while he, who put his life on the line, ended up having to do prison time for far less mens rea than, according to Comey, what Hillary Clinton had.

“Then-Obama administration Attorney General Loretta Lynch was spotted meeting secretly with former President Bill Clinton on an airport tarmac as the probe into Hillary Clinton, which Lynch was overseeing, continued.”

And that is pretty amazing: two planes just happen to sit down and get over to where two people can get together. If it weren’t for the reporter who spotted a guy he thought to be Bill Clinton, we would never have known about this.

I wonder how many DOJ officials would have lied about this if no one had spotted it. I mean, they lied

enough about other things, but they got busted being seen out in a remote spot on the tarmac get-together while the DOJ jury was still out on what they were going to do about Hillary Clinton and she had not testified.

And then we find out, actually, they never had her testify. They gave immunity to her lawyer, Cheryl Mills, and all these people who had direct evidence of potential crimes.

And the prosecutors—and I have been one. You don’t give immunity to someone without knowing what they are going to say. If a lawyer comes to you and says, “My client wants immunity,” then you say, “Give us a proffer. What is your client going to say?” Because we are not just handing out immunity and then there is nothing worth giving immunity to get.

Yet the Obama Justice Department handed out immunity like candy to anybody, it appeared, who was associated and had evidence of potential crimes. They could have gotten a subpoena and gotten laptops of the witnesses, but, instead, the Obama Justice Department said: Do you know what? We will give you immunity not knowing what you are going to say because we really don’t want you to say anything.

That is my interpretation, after having read the immunity agreement.

And, look, the evidence you have got, we just want to look, but we promise you we will never use any of it and we will give the stuff back. We just want to look.

That is outrageous. Were these prosecutors that incompetent or were they that dishonest? It is up to individuals to judge for themselves. But to use a term coined by James Comey, no reasonable prosecutor would have done what they did in that case. They sure didn’t do it when they were trying to chase down anything they possibly could regarding our current President, Donald Trump.

It was revealed last month that FBI’s top lawyer in 2016 thought Hillary Clinton and her team should have immediately realized they were mishandling “‘highly classified’ information based on the obviously sensitive nature of the emails’ content sent through her private server. And he believed”—this is the FBI’s top lawyer—“that she”—Hillary Clinton—“should have been prosecuted until ‘pretty late’ in the investigation, according to a transcript of his closed-door testimony before congressional committees last October.”

□ 1130

And, of course, being pretty late in the investigation, actually goes along with what Lisa Page said; that DOJ prosecutors said, we are not charging her.

And then that ties in nicely with the FBI lawyers saying, Okay, I thought she should have been prosecuted. But then it ties in, by the time the DOJ lawyers/prosecutors said “we are not

charging her,” then he decided, Okay, maybe she shouldn’t be.

Among the texts between Lisa Page and Peter Strzok was one concerning the so-called “insurance policy.”

During her interview with the Judiciary Committee, July 2018, Page was questioned at length about the texts, and essentially referred to the Russia investigation, the insurance policy referred to the Russia investigation, while explaining that officials were proceeding with caution, concerned about the implications of the case while not wanting to go at a total breakneck speed and risk burning sources, as they presumed Trump would be elected anyway.

Further, Lisa Page confirmed investigators only had a paucity of evidence at the start.

Comey, last December, similarly acknowledged that when the FBI initiated its counterintelligence probe and possible collusion between Trump campaign officials and the Russian Government in July 2016, investigators, “didn’t know whether we had anything,” and that, “in fact, when I was fired as Director in May 2017, I still didn’t know whether there was anything to it.”

And that was from Comey.

Trey Gowdy had asked, “I want to believe the path you threw out in Andy McCabe’s office, that there is no way he gets elected, but I am afraid we can’t take the risk. It is like an insurance policy in the unlikely event you die before you are 40.” And that was the quote from the text sent from Peter Strzok to Lisa Page in August of 2016.

So clearly, they were talking about coming up with this bogus Russia investigation as an insurance policy just in case Donald Trump got elected, then they could try to take him out of office, basically, a DOJ coup for the first time in the history of this country.

And, unfortunately, there is no George Washington around to stop this attempted coup that continues today.

“So, upon the opening of the cross-fire hurricane investigation”—which was the name that these DOJ officials who have been shown to have acted to totally inappropriately; that is the name they gave the investigation into Donald Trump—it goes on to say “we had a number of the discussions up through and including the Director regularly in which we were trying to find an answer to the question, right, which is, is there somebody associated with the Trump campaign who is working with the Russians in order to obtain damaging information about Hillary Clinton? And given that it is August, we were very aware of the speed and sensitivity that we needed to operate under.”

It is really amazing.

You see, the way our justice is supposed to work in the United States, and in every State in the union, if you have probable cause to believe a crime

was committed, then you can go after someone for that crime.

In the case of Donald Trump, his campaign, and those that worked with him, they did just the opposite. They said, Here is Donald Trump, he has got a chance of winning—though we don't think he will—so let's try to find something.

And if you go back and look, you can find an Op Ed written by, I believe, Bruce Ohr. And basically, it was from 2007 talking about Russia collusion. And, of course, Donald Trump was not mentioned at all. And then when they came up with this Russia hoax investigation without any evidence at all, there are indications that somebody—perhaps Brennan—had asked the British to spy on Americans so it wouldn't be Americans spying on Americans, which is not supposed to happen unless there is probable cause to believe they have engaged in a crime or—under the Patriot Act—that they are conspiring with a known foreign terrorist.

That is what we were sold when the Patriot Act was reauthorized.

But as we have come to find out that has been greatly loosened up by the DOJ, CIA, NSA, and they pretty much go after everybody they want to.

I found out—I had not been aware of it until this week—that clear back in 2012, the Obama Justice Department made a motion to the FISA court to allow them to unmask information about American citizens if—under this new incredibly relaxed language—it might be of assistance to someone outside the scope that is supposed to be allowed to see this information, if it might assist them in assessing other information.

Well, it doesn't get much more vague than that. And I know from having been on the Judiciary Committee for years, that until the Obama Administration, I had a lot of colleagues on the other side of the aisle that were extremely concerned with privacy issues and the government gathering evidence without probable cause and the government violating the Fourth and Fifth Amendments.

Somehow during those years, I lost my colleagues on the other side that quit being as concerned about privacy invasions and Fourth and Fifth Amendment violations, but I am not aware of anybody on our Judiciary Committee that knew about this motion to just blow the door wide open. And, I think, against the wording of the law, they came up with a motion and got a judge to sign off, apparently, to say, Okay, yes, you can unmask and spread information to anybody outside the originally indicated circle, if it might help them assess other information.

For Heaven's sake, that is an outrage. I couldn't believe it when I was reading that motion.

And what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, it is not classified. It was ordered declassified back years ago. But I haven't met anybody here in Congress that was aware that in 2012, back at that time,

the Obama DOJ was going to blow the door open and start spreading information that people should never have had it, making sure they got it.

And perhaps, that explains to some extent how somebody like Samantha Power could have, I think it was hundreds of American citizens' information unmasked. I mean, basically, they were running our intelligence agency as a political operation to go after anyone that they felt like might be a potential problem for a Democratic administration.

Very, very alarming.

This article from Town Hall is really talking about the bill H.R. 1.

I love the idea of making information more public. It was called For the People legislation. This article says that is really for the government. I would submit it is really more for Democratic politicians. The things in there that would degrade our election process are phenomenal.

We really ought to be going back to paper ballots; that would be the appropriate thing to do, and put proper safeguards on those ballots. I think it would be a good thing to do.

I also like RON KIND's bill—he has been filing ever since he has been here—that would require each person seeking Federal elected office to disclose the identity of anyone who donates anything. You have got a \$200 floor. And I like what RON KIND, my colleague on the other side of the aisle, his bill he has been pushing for years, you know, whether you are a Republican or Democrat, we want to eliminate this having people donate without knowing who is donating.

It leaves open the possibility—and surely, it has happened—that somebody with a lot of money could give \$50, \$50, \$150, over and over and over.

And since you don't have to report it, who it came from, they could be violating—and criminally violating—our election laws.

So I hope that we will have some cleanup of election laws, but not the kind of thing that allows you to go out and harvest votes that didn't happen until after the election.

We have an election day in this country. And to leave that election open so that you could have a Lyndon Johnson style of finding votes after the fact—whether they voted in alphabetical order or not—is just not a good idea. It leaves an opening for stealing elections.

We have an election day, and there ought to be a cutoff; no ballots accepted after this day, at this time. And don't come bringing in a bunch of ballots the next day after you find out how many ballots it is going to take to overturn the election that finished the day before.

I mean, it is third world-type activity with this election. If we heard that a dictator somewhere had put into place some of the things in H.R. 1, we would be outraged and say that is what a dictator does, and it is not right. You

are trying to manipulate the election, and it is totally inappropriate.

Another topic that is, I think, very important, we took up in Judiciary Committee a bill called the Violence Against Women Act; it hadn't been reauthorized in a while. And there has been inequality in the treatment of women compared to men in a number of ways that needed to be addressed. And the Violence Against Women Act addresses some of those.

But now this bill goes too far and does damage to so many of the equality gains by women over the decades. And one of the problems created in the new Violence Against Women Act involves what most people call transgender, but the Diagnostics and Statistical Manual, Fifth Edition—which in many ways the DSM-4, DSM-5—they begin to incorporate a great deal of politics in some areas as much as they incorporated medicine.

□ 1145

The definition or the term given in DSM-5 for what is commonly called transgender is someone who suffers from gender dysphoria. That is a bit of a reclassification from where DSM-III and DSM-IV were.

The definition they give for gender dysphoria is “distress that accompanies the incongruence between one's experienced and expressed gender and one's assigned or natal gender.”

Then it also defines dysphoria as a condition in which a person experiences intense feelings of depression, discontent, and, in some cases, indifference to the world around them.

Some have said, well, dysphoria is the opposite of euphoria, so it is someone who has difficulty dealing with the gender with which they were born. That is someone unhappy with, confused about, displeased with, or depressed about the gender which they have.

We have made so much progress over the years. I saw it as a felony judge. So often in cases involving domestic abuse, involving sexual assault, the women have not been treated fairly, and they have been demonized. Their victimization has not been properly considered.

Over the years, we have gotten better and our justice system has gotten better. It certainly has in Texas.

Some people, including my old friend, former Congressman Ted Poe, another former felony judge from Houston, saw the way women were not always treated properly as victims of sexual assault.

Most D.A.'s offices were required to have victim's assistance that could help, advise, counsel, and comfort victims of sexual assault. But this Violence Against Women Act that was passed by the committee with many of the Republicans voting “no”—maybe all of us; I am not sure—it sets women's rights back significantly.

I am pointing this out with a heart that has broken for women who I have

seen so abused. Sometimes it was even harder on the women because they would end up blaming themselves. There were many times when I would call either a woman victim or a child victim up because I could tell they had that mentality that “I probably deserved what I got.”

After the trial was over, I would tell them: You need to understand, this is not your fault. You didn’t deserve this. This was a crime committed against you. You had nothing to do with this. It was nothing that you should have done. It was a crime being committed against you, and you were not properly protected. For that, I am sorry.

Again, this Violence Against Women Act does not take into account what has come to be known. As we have tried to be more sensitive and caring, and appropriately so, for female victims of domestic abuse, sexual assault, and aggravated sexual assault, the crimes against women can be, obviously, committed against men and have been. But most often, it is against women and, therefore, deserves special consideration.

If you go to health.com, this site has information talking about female victims of sexual assault. Most people are familiar with post-traumatic stress disorder, PTSD, for soldiers. But this points out: “In some ways, the trauma from sexual assault may be worse than the trauma from combat because, normally, soldiers are prepared and trained for combat.” It points out that PTSD affects about 3.5 percent of U.S. adults, but women are twice as likely as men to have PTSD.

For those who are not aware, there is a difference between men and women, and these kinds of statistics bear that out.

Another article from Lindsay Burgess in March of 2018 says: “For survivors of sexual assault, the odds of developing post-traumatic stress disorder, PTSD, are high: Up to 94 percent,” and it is talking about women who experience or are victims of assault, “experience symptoms during the first 2 weeks after the incident, and up to 50 percent may struggle long term. For these survivors, day-to-day events . . . can hit especially hard. And like any mental health issue, PTSD can be debilitating.”

It also goes on to point out: “PTSD is commonly associated with combat veterans, but around 50 percent of PTSD cases in the U.S. develop in the aftermath of sexual or physical violence. Despite the high number, it is important to recognize that some sexual assault survivors feel ‘okay’ afterward, and that is equally valid.

“‘Being sexually assaulted or abused is such an invasion of our body, personal space, and safety,’ says Kande Lewis, executive director of The Positive Results Corporation. ‘People often can’t move past that point.’

“Psychotherapist Akiami McCoy, LCSW, LCSW-C, explains that PTSD is more common among survivors who

felt that their lives were in danger during the assault. ‘The brain does not perform well for a victim during a sexual assault,’ says McCoy. She explains that this is because the ‘fight or flight’ response kicks in. ‘Unfortunately, most victims are overpowered, and they can do neither. They may instead disassociate themselves from the act, and that is where the mind escapes the body until the assault is over.’

“Because dissociation is common among sexual assault survivors, during and after the event, a 2015 study looked into and found strong links between dissociation and PTSD.”

It goes on to say that most people who have lived through major trauma don’t develop PTSD. Unfortunately, survivors of sexual assault and rape have particularly high chances of experiencing symptoms of the disorder.

In fact, the overwhelming majority of rape victims experience at least some PTSD symptoms within just 2 weeks. Almost a third of all women continued to experience their symptoms 9 months after being raped. Overall, more than two-thirds of all victims of sexual assault and rape develop stress reactions that qualify as moderate or severe.

In a study published in 2005 in the journal “Behaviour Research and Therapy,” a team of British researchers explored the connection between unwanted memories in survivors of sexual assault and the severity of PTSD symptoms. The researchers found that assault survivors who are easily and frequently triggered by visual reminders of their trauma can experience a sharp increase in their symptom’s intensity.

Then this goes—I guess it is commonly reported—that one out of four women will be victims of sexual assault. When you consider, if that is accurate, those kinds of numbers, that you have that many women who have been sexually assaulted, and they go into a public restroom that is for women, in a confined space, having a biological man come walking in because he indicates he feels like a woman that day, it can trigger those experiences of sexual assault all over again.

Why would we do that? Women have made so much progress toward equality. And I understand the hearts of my Democratic friends who wanted to allow transgenders to go in any restroom they feel like they should go into. I understand they want to help people who are often victims of abuse themselves. I get the desire to help them, but why traumatize women when it is unnecessary?

We had people in the community say, well, there is no indication anybody has ever been bothered by having a biological man come into a women’s restroom or private facilities for women. I am sure they were being sincere. They were not familiar, but they abound.

That is why there is a lawsuit in Fresno, California. This is a homeless

shelter. Who goes to homeless shelters? Often, very often—and I have been there; I have talked to them—it is women who have been sexually abused. Often, it is domestic abuse by a partner or a spouse or a husband. They have nowhere else to go. They are afraid if they go to a friend’s home, that husband will find them. They do have to be careful.

Right in Marshall, Texas, the inspiration for Kari’s Law that we passed in the last Congress, she was afraid of her husband. He was abusive, but she was supposed to let him see the kids. He took them to a hotel room, and he pulled her into the bathroom and beat her with his fist for many minutes. Eventually, he took a knife and began stabbing her over 20 times, ultimately killing her, while her young daughter was trying to dial 911, not knowing she had to dial a prefix.

It was one event out of far too many events where a victim of domestic abuse, just trying to hang on and not be abused further, they go to a homeless shelter, having been abused, beaten, many times raped, and they think, at a homeless shelter, they would be protected against triggers that would make them relive the trauma of their aggravated rape.

□ 1200

When you talk to people who work in those facilities, they work there because they care deeply about women who have been harmed. They have immense hearts caring deeply. That is why they are there. Yet this law will end up forcing these women to be cohabitating with biological men.

Whether they are honest about feeling like a woman or not, why should we pass laws that force women victims of sexual assault to be further traumatized?

That is not appropriate for a government role.

In this case from the “Toronto Sun,” a predator—who claimed to be transgender—because of his sexual crimes had been declared to be a dangerous sexual offender. Let’s face it, like this guy in Toronto, Canada, since you don’t have to have any overt proof, Mr. Speaker, no patent proof that you feel like a woman, you can just say it, and people under the new Violence Against Women Act have to recognize it, then this will not be an isolated incident.

I have seen it, I have prosecuted it, and I have sentenced it. These predators look for any way they can to get a woman in a defensive position—a woman or a child—someone whom they can render helpless. If they will drill holes through walls so they can spy, do you think they wouldn’t go to the trouble of walking in?

Because if you drill a hole and spy, Mr. Speaker, you can be arrested for being a Peeping Tom. But if you, under the new proposed laws, simply say: “I feel like a woman today,” then you can go in and be a voyeur all you want to,

and it opens the door to sexual deviants that should not have a door available to them.

There is another here from “The Courier” in the U.K. The mom of a super-market sexual assault victim warns that her attacker will strike again.

Regarding the lawsuit from the Eastern District of California about the man who claimed to be transgender, why would we pass a law that would undo the great appropriate advances that have occurred for women's rights toward equality and toward not being victimized?

I know the intention is to try to help people who have gender dysphoria, gender confusion, from being victims so they can walk into any restroom they want to, but it is a mistake that will do far more damage to women, and it is just tragic to have that kind of law included in the Violence Against Women Act.

It was mentioned by a friend across the aisle—and I know his motivation. He has a big heart and he cares about people who are victims, and that includes people who have gender dysphoria—but he was bragging about—apparently according to what he said—that equality law was being passed yesterday that will open the door to equality for transgender across sports and education and across the board.

We are already seeing something that is just incredible. Martina Navratilova is probably one of the top five women tennis players of all time and has been an icon for so many tennis players, especially for liberal tennis players, liberal women, because she has fought so for gay rights. Yet she is now being attacked because she dared to say that she didn't think that someone who is a biological man with biological advantages over a biological woman, in most cases, should be able to compete in women's tennis.

How is that something to beat her up for verbally?

How is that something to abuse her for?

What will happen to the great progress of equality for women if that bill becomes law will be it will eliminate women's sports. You may occasionally have a woman who desires to compete as a man who is extraordinary and can win some things. The doctors talk about the potential for greater muscle mass, they are built differently, can do better in some sports than women can, as a general rule. And, yes, I know there are women that could kick the rear of many men, including me, I know, I get that. But we are talking about competition at the highest levels, and it is grossly unfair to allow a biological man to compete in women's sports. No matter how gender dysphorically confused the person is, it is unfair to the great progress of women's equality.

What that bill will do if it becomes the law is it will bring an end to women's sports. You will be left with mainly men's sports and co-ed sports—co-ed

sports consisting of the women and the men who say they are women, and it will end the equality, the fairness that has come to be known in Title IX and through women's sports and women's professional sports, that they will become co-ed sports. It is tremendously unfair to women.

Now, the final thing I want to bring up is the resolution we took up in here regarding hate last week. The reason that all came about were specific comments by a Member of the House that most everyone here, not all, but most believe were anti-Semitic. For those in Congress who don't understand, anti-Semitic comments are not criticism of one person for something they have said or done. That is not anti-Semitic, even if that person happens to be Jewish. It is not. So when I criticized George Soros for damage I believe he has done to my country by the things that he has contributed to, by the damage he has done to countries yearning to be free in Europe as he has pushed them toward socialism—why would a billionaire push people toward socialism?

Because socialism means everybody is treated equally.

It is because he knows that in a Socialist country after you eliminate the middle class, what you are left with, Mr. Speaker, is a very thin veneer of a ruling class and everybody else who is ruled over by the ruling class. That is where socialism goes. Some billionaires think, oh, they will be there in that tiny, little, ruling class, not understanding that historically if you go to full-bore socialism or communism, you are going to end up killing off the billionaires and taking their money. So it is an amazing thing to see that.

I am also aware that even Israel's defense ministry has pointed out the damage that George Soros has done to Israel. Because I have criticized George Soros, people say: Oh, you are anti-Semitic.

It is not anti-Semitic to criticize somebody for things they have done, things they are paying for, or things they are contributing to just because they happen to be Jewish. What makes it anti-Semitic is when you slander or libel an entire race or group of people and smear them as all having the same characteristics and belittle them as a group.

So there was a resolution that was supposed to address specific anti-Semitic remarks by a Member of Congress, and then we hear, well, there were protests because they didn't want her condemned for anti-Semitic remarks. So it got watered down.

I printed out the copy of the resolution as it was at 3 o'clock that afternoon. I came over here ready to speak against that resolution because it had been so watered down, and I was told: well, actually, that one got pulled and they watered it down even further, and here is the new one, as of about 3:20 that afternoon.

It kept being watered down until it basically said that we are against all

kinds of hate. Of course, they didn't mention the kind of political hate that would cause a Democrat—and if it had been a Republican who supported Donald Trump, that would have been what everybody talked about, oh, gosh, this is what Trump inspires, but since it was a Bernie Sanders supporter, I don't know of any Republican, including me, who has blamed BERNIE SANDERS for the criminal who shot STEVE SCALISE and tried to kill my baseball friends and colleagues. He wanted to kill them all, but that wasn't singled out.

In fact, when we were taking testimony on gun crime in Judiciary, the majority would not even allow STEVE SCALISE to testify. Oh, well, if he comes in and testifies, it might open the door to all kinds of other Members of Congress.

Well, why don't you just say that we will restrict the testimony from Members of Congress to those who have been shot by somebody who hates them and their party?

How about that?

But STEVE was not even allowed to come testify before our committee. That kind of thing was not mentioned in what was, basically, we are against all kinds of hate, except for that, and we are also not going to call out the hate that causes the hate hoaxes which there seem to be a rash of people saying they are the victim of some hate when actually it is their hate that created a hoax.

But I have made loud and clear repetitiously, the reason I and 22 others voted against that resolution was because it did not do what it should have done, and that is, call out specific anti-Semitic comments.

Now, some were bothered that I said that there is no moral equivalence between the Holocaust and say the years of slavery, the slavery that is continuing today. I was shocked to find out this year that there are 40 million slaves in the world today, more than any time in history. We ought to do all we can to stop it. It is horrendous. It did so much damage to the core of this country for far too long. But there is a special hatred that the Jewish people have experienced that we need to stop when it starts. For those morons who didn't know, I voted against the first anti-hate resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 18, 2019, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

376. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's joint final rule — Community Reinvestment Act Regulations (RIN: 3064-AE97) received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

377. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Limited Exception for a Capped Amount of Reciprocal Deposits From Treatment as Brokered Deposits (RIN: 3064-AE89) received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

378. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Depository Institution Management Interlocks Act (RIN: 3064-AE92) received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

379. A letter from the Senior Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Financial Research, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Ongoing Data Collection of Centrally Cleared Transactions in the U.S. Repurchase Agreement Market (RIN: 1505-AC58) received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

380. A letter from the PRAO Branch Chief, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hiring Flexibility Under Professional Standards [FNS-2017-0039] (RIN: 0584-AE60) received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

381. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Fossil Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — SPR Standard Sales Provisions (RIN: 1901-AB29) received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

382. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Additives Permitted in Feed and Drinking Water of Animals; Selenomethionine Hydroxy Analogue [Docket No.: FDA-2015-F-2712] received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

383. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; GA: Emission Reduction Credits [EPA-R04-OAR-2009-0226; FRL-9990-74-Region 4] received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

384. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Massachusetts; High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes [EPA-R01-OAR-2018-0790; FRL-9990-94-Region 1] received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

385. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's

final rule — Air Quality Designation for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂) Primary National Ambient Air Quality Standard; Arkansas; Redesignation of the Independence County Area [EPA-R06-OAR-2018-0624; FRL-9990-00-Region 6] received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

386. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Amendment to Control of Emissions of Volatile Organic Compounds from Consumer Products [EPA-R03-OAR-2018-0153; FRL-9990-86-Region 3] received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

387. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California; South Coast Serious Area Plan for the 2006 PM_{2.5} NAAQS; Correction [EPA-R09-OAR-2017-0490; FRL-9990-89-Region 9] received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

388. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Clean Air Plans; 2008 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area Requirements; San Joaquin Valley, California; Correction [EPA-R09-OAR-2018-0535; FRL-9990-90-Region 9] received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

389. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Oklahoma: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [EPA-R06-RCA-2017-0324; FRL-9990-04-Region 6] received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

390. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Advanced Methods to Target and Eliminate Unlawful Robocalls [CG Docket No.: 17-59] received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

391. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Disability Rights Office, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Misuse of Internal Protocol (IP) Captioned Telephone Service [CG Docket No.: 13-24]; Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities [CG Docket No.: 03-123] received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

392. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Legal and Policy, Auctions Division, Office of Economics and Analytics, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Connect America Fund [WC Docket No.: 10-90]; Universal Service Reform — Mobility Fund [WT Docket No.: 10-208] received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

393. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Implementation of Amended Section 203(a)(1)(B) of the Federal Power Act [Docket No.: RM19-4-000; Order No.: 855] received March 13, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

394. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 22-563, "Short-Term Rental Regulation Act of 2018", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BRADY (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. NUNES, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. REED, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. ESTES, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. BANKS, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mrs. MILLER):

H.R. 1753. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself, Mr. BARR, Ms. TITUS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. DELAURIO, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WATKINS, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. COOK, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 1754. A bill to improve the integrity and safety of horseracing by requiring a uniform anti-doping and medication control program to be developed and enforced by an independent Horseracing Anti-Doping and Medication Control Authority; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 1755. A bill to provide for congressional approval of national emergency declarations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. TLAIB (for herself, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. NORTON, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. OMAR, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Ms. SHALALA):

H.R. 1756. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to prohibit the use of consumer reports and consumer information in making any determination involving auto

insurance with respect to a consumer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. UNDERWOOD (for herself and Mr. CASTEN of Illinois):

H.R. 1757. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the limitation on the amount individuals can deduct for certain State and local taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 1758. A bill to provide for the retroactive application of the mandatory increase in insurance coverage under the Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance for members of the Armed Forces deployed to combat theaters of operation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. MURPHY (for herself, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, and Mr. LAHOOD):

H.R. 1759. A bill to amend title III of the Social Security Act to extend reemployment services and eligibility assessments to all claimants for unemployment compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLORES (for himself and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 1760. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish and carry out a program to support the availability of HA-LEU for domestic commercial use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. BUDD, Mr. GUEST, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 1761. A bill to prohibit Federal funding of State firearm ownership databases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. BERA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COOPER, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LONG, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. WOODALL, and Mr. WOMACK):

H.R. 1762. A bill to provide high-skilled visas for nationals of the Republic of Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama (for herself, Mr. KATKO, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 1763. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 1764. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act with respect to permitting terms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama,

Ms. ADAMS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 1765. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage under the Medicare program for FDA-approved qualifying colorectal cancer screening blood-based tests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MITCHELL (for himself, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. HARDER of California):

H.R. 1766. A bill to establish a postsecondary student data system; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COLE, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFALZIO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. EMMER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. KATKO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MENG, Mr. PETERSON, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIRE, Mr. STAUBER, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. TONKO, and Ms. WILD):

H.R. 1767. A bill to increase the number of States that may conduct Medicaid demonstration programs to improve access to community mental health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself, Mr. LONG, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 1768. A bill to reauthorize subtitle G of title VII of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, relating to diesel emissions reduction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GROTHMAN, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. KIND, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. REED, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. TONKO, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. LONG, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. DELGADO):

H.R. 1769. A bill to require enforcement against misbranded milk alternatives; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 1770. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income certain amounts realized on the disposition of property raised or produced by a student agriculturist, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. WOODALL, Ms. BASS, and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 1771. A bill to require consultations on reuniting Korean Americans with family

members in North Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee:

H.R. 1772. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to penalize false communications to cause an emergency response, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 1773. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the women in the United States who joined the workforce during World War II, providing the aircraft, vehicles, weaponry, ammunition and other material to win the war, that were referred to as "Rosie the Riveter", in recognition of their contributions to the United States and the inspiration they have provided to ensuing generations; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY):

H.R. 1774. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit against income tax for employees who participate in qualified apprenticeship programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STAUBER (for himself and Mr. DESAULNIER):

H.R. 1775. A bill to establish a task force on NOTAM improvements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 1776. A bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit importation, exportation, transportation, sale, receipt, acquisition, and purchase in interstate or foreign commerce, or in a manner substantially affecting interstate or foreign commerce, of any live animal of any prohibited wildlife species; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CRIST, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. PALONE, Ms. HAALAND, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 1777. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide equal treatment of LGBT older individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BRINDISI (for himself and Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1778. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide a special rule for the period of admission of H-2A non-immigrants employed as dairy workers and sheepherders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 1779. A bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, to authorize a person

awarded the Medal of Honor to designate an individual to receive the special pension after death, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BYRNE (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. TONKO, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 1780. A bill to establish the Commission to study the potential creation of a National Museum of Irish American History, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. GIANFORTE, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 1781. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to provide the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission and the Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission with access to certain drug payment information, including certain rebate information; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 1782. A bill to establish and strengthen projects that defray the cost of related instruction associated with pre-apprenticeship and qualified apprenticeship programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 1783. A bill to provide for increased scrutiny with respect to pesticide residues of glyphosate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. HECK, Mr. KHANNA, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SABLON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. POCAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. OMAR, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. COOPER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. DEAN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. TONKO, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WILD, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Il-

linois, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SOTO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BERA, Mr. GALLEGOS, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SARABANES, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. KILMER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MCEachin, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. RUSH, Mr. AGUILAR, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. MENG, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. RYAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. BEYER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. WATERS, Ms. DELBENE, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire):

H.R. 1784. A bill to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, and Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOLDEN (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1785. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exempt certain 16- and 17-year-old individuals employed in timber harvesting entities or mechanized timber harvesting entities from child labor laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico (for herself, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SUOZZI):

H.R. 1786. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the limitation on the cover over of distilled spirits taxes to Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands and to transfer a portion of such cover over to the Puerto Rico Conservation Trust Fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. FRANKEL, and Mr. DEUTCH):

H.R. 1787. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to impose certain additional requirements on applicants for COPS grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HILL of California (for herself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. COX of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. ROSE of New York, and Mr. BABIN):

H.R. 1788. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to limit the penalty for late enrollment under part B of the Medicare Program to 15 percent and twice the period of no enrollment, and to exclude periods of COBRA, retiree, and VA coverage from such

late enrollment penalty; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina):

H.R. 1789. A bill to eliminate the discount for UHF television stations for purposes of the limitation on the aggregate national audience reach of television broadcast stations in which a party may have a cognizable interest; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 1790. A bill to require any amounts remaining in Members' Representational Allowances at the end of a fiscal year to be deposited in the Treasury and used for deficit reduction or to reduce the Federal debt; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington (for himself, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.R. 1791. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt survivor benefit annuity plan payments from the individual alternative minimum tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEVIN of California (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. HILL of California, Mrs. LURIA, and Ms. SPANBERGER):

H.R. 1792. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to address health, safety, and environmental hazards at private military housing units, to prohibit the payment by members of the Armed Forces of deposits or other fees relating to such housing units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 1793. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that a deduction equal to fair market value shall be allowed for charitable contributions of literary, musical, artistic, or scholarly compositions created by the donor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 1794. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion from gross income for AmeriCorps educational awards; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself and Ms. STEFANIK):

H.R. 1795. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense, upon request of the Ministry of Defense of Israel and with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to carry out research, development, test, and evaluation activities, on a joint basis with Israel, to establish directed energy capabilities that address threats to the United States, deployed forces of the United States, or Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. ARMSTRONG, Mr. GIANFORTE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 1796. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the qualifying advanced coal project credit, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1797. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to remove the authority of the National Capital Planning Commission with respect to property owned by the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 1798. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction allowed for student loan interest and to exclude from gross income discharges of income contingent or income-based student loan indebtedness; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COOPER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. COLE, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CRIST, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. PETERS):

H.R. 1799. A bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIREs:

H.R. 1800. A bill to modify the minimum allocation requirement for the emergency solutions grants program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SMUCKER (for himself and Mr. CARBAJAL):

H.R. 1801. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to develop a strategy to recruit and retain mental health providers, to direct the Secretaries of the military departments to develop medication monitoring programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMUCKER (for himself, Mr. EMMER, and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 1802. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to waive the requirement of certain veterans to make copayments for hospital care and medical services in the case of an error by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 1803. A bill to nullify the Supplemental Treaty Between the United States of America and the Confederate Tribes and Bands of Indians of Middle Oregon, concluded on November 15, 1865; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WALKER (for himself and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 1804. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit qualified amateur sports organizations from prohibiting or substantially restricting the use of an athlete's name, image, or likeness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WENSTRUP (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KILMER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. TURNER, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. COLE, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. HICE of Georgia):

H.R. 1805. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemora-

tion of the centennial of the establishment of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 1806. A bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to protect the cultural practices and livelihoods of producers of Alaska Native handicrafts and fossilized ivory products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 1807. A bill to extend the authorization of appropriations to the Department of Veterans Affairs for purposes of awarding grants to veterans service organizations for the transportation of highly rural veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE (for himself, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.J. Res. 51. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUDA:

H. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution recognizing the necessity of preserving official and unofficial records of meetings between the President of the United States and foreign leaders, for the purposes of promoting transparency and the national security of the United States of America; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. Res. 229. A resolution expressing support for designation of the month of August as National Destroyer Recognition Month; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. POCAN, Mr. COOK, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H. Res. 230. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States condemns all forms of violence against children globally and recognizes the harmful impacts of violence against children; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. HAYES (for herself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DEUTCH, and Ms. DELAUNO):

H. Res. 231. A resolution keeping guns out of classrooms; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FOSTER (for himself, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. DUNN, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. HIMES, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma):

H. Res. 232. A resolution expressing support for designation of March 14, 2019, as "National Pi Day"; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. DOGGETT):

H. Res. 233. A resolution condemning the Government of the Philippines for its continued detention of Senator Leila De Lima,

calling for her immediate release, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CORREA (for himself, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CISNEROS, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. POSTER, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PARNETTA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIREs, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SOTO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. TITUS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mr. GARCIA of Illinois, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, and Mr. RASKIN):

H. Res. 234. A resolution recognizing the heritage, culture, and contributions of Latinas in the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H. Res. 235. A resolution recognizing Women's History Month and the historic contributions of women to the American labor movement; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H. Res. 236. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that welfare programs discourage marriage and hurt the institution of the family in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BARR, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H. Res. 237. A resolution expressing support for designation of March 21, 2019, as "National Rosie the Riveter Day"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. SPEIER):

H. Res. 238. A resolution recognizing the cultural and historical significance of Nowruz; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H. Res. 239. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to remove the motion to recommit; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MEADOWS, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. TITUS):

H. Res. 240. A resolution expressing support for the designation of July 30, 2019, as "National Whistleblower Appreciation Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. STEUBE (for himself, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H. Res. 241. A resolution condemning the anti-Semitic comments of Representative Ilhan Omar from Minnesota; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to

the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Ethics, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

6. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 85, urging Congress to enact the Military Surviving Spouses Equity Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 163, urging the United States Congress to pass legislation to automatically enroll veterans for benefits they are entitled to in the United States Department of Veterans Affairs system; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

8. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, relative to House Resolution No. 122, commending and supporting the President of the United States and his decision to secure our borders by declaring a national emergency, and commending and thanking the men and women of the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means, and Homeland Security.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. KING of New York introduced a bill (H.R. 1808) for the relief of Alemseghed Mussie Tesfamical; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BRADY:

H.R. 1753.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to "provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 1754.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. ROY:

H.R. 1755.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. 1 §8

By Ms. TLAIB:

H.R. 1756.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to "regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes

By Ms. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 1757.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Constitution of the United States, Article 1, Section 8

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 1758.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mrs. MURPHY:

H.R. 1759.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, which grants Congress the power to "provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. FLORES:

H.R. 1760.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 1761.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Consitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof" and the Second Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, which states that the "A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed."

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 1762.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. SEWELL of Alabama:

H.R. 1763.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution [Page H3003]

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 1764.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 1765.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 3—Congress has the ability to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H.R. 1766.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 1767.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 1768.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 1769.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. McCAUL:

H.R. 1770.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 1771.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution [Page H1 0170]

By Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee:

H.R. 1772.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers and all Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 1773.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 1774.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of, and the Sixteenth Amendment to, the United States Constitution. [Page H4186]

By Mr. STAUBER:

H.R. 1775.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3 (related to the regulation of Commerce with foreign Nation, and among the several States, and with Indian tribes).

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 1776.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. BONAMICI:

H.R. 1777.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. BRINDISI:

H.R. 1778.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 4 provides Congress with the power to establish a "uniform rule of Naturalization."

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 1779.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. BYRNE:

H.R. 1780.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 1781.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 1782.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 1783.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution, Article 1 Section 8

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 1784.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H.R. 1785.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3
By Miss GONZALEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico:

H.R. 1786.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the U.S. Constitution, which provide as follows:

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States; [. . .]

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes; [. . .]—And

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

Moreover, the Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article IV, Section 3, which provides, in relevant part, as follows:

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 1787.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. HILL of California:

H.R. 1788.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 1789.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 1790.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. LARSEN of Washington:

H.R. 1791.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

As described in Article 1, Section 1: “all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives

By Mr. LEVIN of California:

H.R. 1792.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 14 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 1793.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 1794.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 1795.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 1796.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

Section 8—Powers of Congress. To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1797.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: clause 17 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 1798.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1799.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Fifteenth Amendment, Section 2, Section 1: The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the U.S. or by any State on account of race, color, or perilous condition of servitude.

By Mr. SIRE:

H.R. 1800.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 1801.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8.

By Mr. SMUCKER:

H.R. 1802.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8.

By Mr. WALDEN:

H.R. 1803.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate commerce with Indian Tribes).

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 1804.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 1805.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 5 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution: “The Congress shall have the power . . . to coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures.”

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 1806.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

“The Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among several states, and with the Indian Tribes”

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 1807.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 1808.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE:

H.J. Res. 51.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the Constitution, which grants Congress the authority, whenever two thirds of both Houses deem it necessary, to propose amendments to the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6: Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. MORELLE.

H.R. 95: Mrs. AXNE and Mrs. LEE of Nevada.

H.R. 101: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 273: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 302: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 303: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 307: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 444: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 445: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 500: Mrs. MILLER, Mr. EMMER, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. COSTA, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. COOK, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 597: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 613: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 641: Ms. HAALAND.
 H.R. 647: Mr. RASKIN.
 H.R. 656: Ms. SANCHEZ.
 H.R. 662: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 677: Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 689: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 692: Mrs. LESKO.
 H.R. 693: Mr. WALKER.
 H.R. 712: Ms. HILL of California and Mr. LAMB.
 H.R. 730: Mr. GALLAGHER and Mrs. HARTZLER.
 H.R. 741: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 754: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
 H.R. 759: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
 H.R. 794: Ms. PRESSLEY.
 H.R. 816: Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 838: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. BUDD.
 H.R. 873: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. HARDER of California, and Mr. CISNEROS.
 H.R. 906: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska and Mr. COOK.
 H.R. 948: Mr. COLE.
 H.R. 949: Mr. CLOUD.
 H.R. 959: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. CONNOLLY, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. WILD, and Mr. GOHMERT.
 H.R. 960: Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. CONNOLLY, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. WILD, and Mr. GOHMERT.
 H.R. 978: Mr. HORSFORD and Ms. WILD.
 H.R. 1002: Ms. SHALALA, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. CROW.
 H.R. 1004: Mr. MEEKS and Miss RICE of New York.
 H.R. 1044: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. KEATING, and Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.
 H.R. 1066: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.
 H.R. 1073: Ms. HAALAND.
 H.R. 1081: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
 H.R. 1104: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 1117: Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
 H.R. 1179: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 1185: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
 H.R. 1195: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. BARR, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. HECK, and Mr. SIRES.
 H.R. 1226: Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 1232: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 1237: Ms. GABBARD.
 H.R. 1254: Mr. GOHMERT.
 H.R. 1255: Mrs. LURIA.
 H.R. 1256: Mr. KIM.
 H.R. 1285: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 1298: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CROW, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Ms. OMAR, and Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 1306: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.
 H.R. 1310: Mrs. AXNE.
 H.R. 1325: Mr. KIM.
 H.R. 1328: Ms. MENG.
 H.R. 1348: Mr. CARBAJAL.
 H.R. 1354: Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
 H.R. 1379: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 1380: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 1397: Mr. NORMAN and Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 1423: Mr. HECK.
 H.R. 1434: Mr. BUCHSHON and Mr. SPANO.
 H.R. 1439: Mr. MORELLE.
 H.R. 1454: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. DOGGETT.
 H.R. 1459: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
 H.R. 1473: Mr. FERGUSON.
 H.R. 1504: Mr. FOSTER.
 H.R. 1545: Mrs. HARTZLER.
 H.R. 1553: Ms. MOORE.
 H.R. 1556: Mr. KHANNA.
 H.R. 1573: Mr. LAMB.
 H.R. 1581: Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. LEE of Nevada, and Mr. YARMUTH.
 H.R. 1595: Ms. MENG, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. DEAN, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. EVANS, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 1610: Mr. LAWSON of Florida.
 H.R. 1615: Mr. KIM, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. GOLDEN.
 H.R. 1616: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. WRIGHT.
 H.R. 1622: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. GAETZ, Ms. MENG, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. AGUILAR, and Mr. MARSHALL.
 H.R. 1629: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 1630: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 1641: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 1644: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SANCHEZ, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
 H.R. 1673: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H.R. 1690: Mr. NADLER, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Mrs. DEMINGS.
 H.R. 1730: Mr. LATTI and Mr. MOULTON.
 H.R. 1739: Mr. BUCK.
 H.R. 1748: Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. POCAN, Miss RICE of New York, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. KING of New York.
 H.J. Res. 2: Mr. KIND.
 H. Con. Res. 20: Mr. COSTA.
 H. Res. 23: Ms. HILL of California, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. KEATING, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
 H. Res. 54: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. GOLDEN, and Mr. NEGUSE.
 H. Res. 92: Mr. WALTZ.
 H. Res. 107: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. WALKER, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. LATTI, Mr. ROSE of New York, and Mr. NORMAN.
 H. Res. 114: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
 H. Res. 124: Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. STANTON, Mr. POCAN, Ms. OMAR, Mr. BERA, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. BASS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. VELA, and Mr. ROUDA.
 H. Res. 141: Mr. MEEKS and Mr. CICILLINE.
 H. Res. 173: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. TORRES of California, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 1004: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.